A8012-1.1 F 3/82

Research Report on America's Cities

A TIME TO BUILD UP
A Survey of Cities About Housing Policy

One of a series of Research Reports on major empirical studies of conditions and policies in America's municipalities.

NATIONAL LEAGUE OF CITIES

Research Reports on America's Cities

NLC's "Research Reports" series consists of empirical studies about conditions and policies in America's municipalities. The series editor is William Barnes, Research Director, NLC.

Reports in this series include:

- Capital Budgeting and Infrastructure in American Cities
- Employment Problems and America's Cities
- City Fiscal Conditions and Outlook for FY 85
- City Fiscal Conditions in 1986
- Women in Municipal Government, 1986
- A Time to Build Up

FOR ORDERING INFORMATION ON THESE OR OTHER NLC PUBLICATIONS, CONTACT:

Publications Sales
National League of Cities
1301 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
(202) 626-3000

A TIME TO BUILD UP:
A Survey of Cities About Housing Policy

By

William R. Barnes
Research Director
National League of Cities

February 1987

A Research Report
of the National League of Cities Institute

Copyright © 1987 by the

National League of Cities
Washington, D.C. 20004
ISBN 0-933729-18-9

Price: $10.00 per copy to NLC members
$15.00 per copy to Non-members

Please add $2.00 for postage and handling.
Special rates available for multiple copies.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
PREFACE	i.
AUTHOR'S ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	iii.
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER II: PEOPLE WHO FACE HOUSING PROBLEMS	5
1) Assessments of Groups' Housing Problems	5
2) Severe Problems, by Region and City Size	7
3) A Note on The Data	14
4) What Would Happen to These Groups if Federal Aid Disappeared?	16
CHAPTER III: ASSESSMENTS OF FEDERAL HOUSING PROGRAMS . .	21
1) Would Other Funds Be Found if Federal Housing Assistance Were Terminated?	22
2) Assessments of 21 Federal Housing Aid Programs	23
3) Ranking Federal Programs: The Three "Most Cost Effective"	31
CHAPTER IV: WHAT TYPES OF HOUSING ASSISTANCE ACTIVITIES ARE NEEDED?	39
1) Assessments of The Need for Various Housing Assistance Activities	40
2) Assessments, by Region and City Size	43

PAGE

CHAPTER V: PRIORITIES FOR FEDERAL HOUSING POLICY . . . 55

1) Priorities 55

2) New Construction 58

3) Priorities, by Region and City Size 59

APPENDICES:

A. The Research Process and The Sample A-1

B. Frequency Data and The Questionnaire B-1

C. List of Cities that Responded to the Survey . . C-1

PREFACE

We are pleased to present A Time To Build Up: A Survey of Cities About Housing Policy to NLC's membership and to the public. This is a timely report on a topic of great importance to the nation's cities: the programs and policies needed to address the housing problems of low-income households.

The report is based on a survey of cities, undertaken by NLC in 1986. The survey was requested by NLC's Committee on Community and Economic Development as an aid to policy development. The Chairman of the Committee in 1985 and 1986 was Mayor James E. Roark of Charleston, West Virginia.

The author of the report and director of the survey project is William R. Barnes, Research Director for NLC.

The 444 cities that responded to the survey are quite clear about the need for a continuing Federal role in housing policy. The survey also reveals some clear evaluations of Federal programs and priorities for emphasis in Federal policy.

We believe these and other findings in the report can be useful contributions to the debate over housing authorizations in the Congress during 1987. We invite comments and questions about this study. We hope that it will help in the effort to clarify our nation's housing needs and to address those needs with adequate policies.

Alan Beals
Executive Director

William E. Davis, III
Director, Office of Policy Analysis and Development

AUTHOR'S ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I want to acknowledge and thank others who contributed to this project. First, officials and staff in 444 cities filled out the detailed questionnaire and returned it. Dr. Phillip Clay, of MIT, collaborated on the design of the survey and the initial data input; he will conduct his own analysis of the survey data for another study. Graduate research assistants David Aiken and Eva Orlebeke completed a variety of crucial tasks along the way. Hillel Sukenik provided help with the data input and analysis. Raymond Struyk and Barry Zigas read and commented on a draft of the report. Deborah Johnson typed the manuscript and managed it through numerous revisions.

William R. Barnes

A TIME TO BUILD UP
A Survey of Cities About Housing Policy

by
William R. Barnes
National League of Cities
February 1987

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In 1986, 444 cities responded to an NLC survey about housing problems and policies. These responses can be summarized under the headings of four questions, as follows.

(1) Which groups of people face severe housing problems?

A majority of cities report that homeless persons (58.0 percent of cities) and low income renters (53.4 percent) face "severe" problems locally.

(2) What would happen if all Federal housing assistance programs were terminated?

The big losers would be low income renters. Three out of four cities (76.1 percent) say that, if all Federal housing programs disappear, low income renters will be the group most in need of assistance.

Other groups that would be most in need of help if Federal aid ends are the elderly (in 47.3 percent of cities), female-headed households (40.3 percent), families with three or more children (39.0 percent), and the homeless (22.5 percent).

Nearly all cities (95 percent or more) predict that, if Federal housing aid were to end completely, neither their municipality nor any other source

will replace half or more of the funds needed to provide assistance to poor people.

(3) Are Federal low-income housing programs cost-effective?

All 21 programs assessed in the survey are regarded by majorities of cities as at least "moderately cost-effective" or better. Majorities of the cities that have a basis for judgment say that seven programs are "highly cost-effective":

Community Development Block Grant	84.7%
Section 8, Existing Housing	69.3%
Urban Development Action Grant	62.1%
Rental Rehabilitation Grants	61.2%
Public Housing Modernization	58.6%
Public Housing Operating Subsidy	55.7%
Section 202 (Elderly and Handicapped)	55.5%

From that same list of 21 Federal programs, each city respondent was asked to rank the three "most cost-effective" programs. These aggregated rankings manifest two patterns of results:

- First, two programs are seen as the "most cost-effective" by substantial percentages of cities. This reflects the flexibility and/or broad relevance of these two programs. The two programs that were rated the "most

cost-effective" by the highest percentages of cities are the Community Development Block Grant (73.0 percent) and Section 8 Certificates for Existing Housing (47.1 percent). (In contrast, 5.0 percent of cities say that Housing Vouchers are among the "most cost-effective" programs.)

The next programs in the "most cost-effective" list are Rental Rehabilitation Grants (27.9 percent of cities) and Operating and/or Modernizing Public Housing units (23.7 percent).

- Second, cities spread a majority of their votes for the three "most cost-effective" programs broadly among programs other than CDBG and Section 8 Existing. This reflects the variety of local housing markets and circumstances: different programs are "most cost-effective" in different situations.

(4) What types of housing assistance should be emphasized in Federal policy?

The survey asked city officials to imagine that Federal housing assistance policies were to be completely revised and adequately funded. Putting aside programmatic details, what three types of housing activities should be the top priorities for emphasis in Federal housing policy? The activities that received these top priority votes from the highest percentages of cities are:

Rental assistance (money payments)	60.8%
Rehabilitation of single-family houses	52.9%
Rehabilitation of multi-family units (privately owned)	43.2%
Construction of new multi-family units	27.7%
Construction of new public housing units	20.7%

These findings lead to several conclusions regarding city officials' views about future Federal housing policy.

- Adequate Federal housing assistance, targeted to low- and moderate-income households, must be continued if the housing needs of these households are to be addressed.

- Existing programs are cost-effective and should be retained (until and unless appropriate and adequately-funded replacements are in place).

- Federal housing policy (1) should put special emphasis on direct rental assistance to poor people and on rehabilitation programs; and (2) should also reflect the variety of other local circumstances and needs---especially new multi-family construction, both publicly and privately owned---through a broad array of categorical programs and/or a housing block grant.

- Federal housing policy should not be reduced to any single dimension (e.g., housing vouchers).

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

For Federal housing assistance programs, the years since 1980 have been a time to scale down. Budget authority for additional units has been cut drastically; the mix of the types of housing assistance provided has changed dramatically. In the near future, the expiration of housing assistance that was authorized in the 1970s raises the possibility that not only will Federal housing assistance not grow, but it will suffer absolute declines in the number of households assisted.

These trends in Federal housing policy do not reflect a consensus. They are the outcome of vigorous disagreement and intense struggle among the decision-makers in the Congress and the Administration and among interest groups. Federal housing policy has been, and continues to be, in considerable disarray. For example, since 1980, there has been only one authorization of Federal housing programs. Instead, programs continue year to year in appropriation bills. There has also been continuous strife over vital details of program operation and these arguments persist. Meanwhile, housing problems of low-income households remain.

In this situation, the National League of Cities decided to ask city officials for their views on various aspects of housing policy. NLC mailed a questionnaire to cities in the spring of 1986 and 444 cities responded.

These 444 cities say that Federal housing aid is crucial, that no other source will replace disappearing Federal assistance. It is not, in the view of these city officials, a time to tear down Federal programs; it is time to build them up. These officials also have clear views on the priorities that should be emphasized in a revitalized Federal housing policy.

The chapters that follow address four broad aspects of housing policy:

(1) Housing problems faced by various groups in cities;

(2) The ability of Federal programs to provide cost-effective solutions;

(3) Activities which local officials prescribe to address these problems; and

(4) Priorities for emphasis in Federal housing policy.

Each of these topics corresponds to a chapter in the body of the report.

Chapter II commences the analysis with a look at the severity of the housing situation for various groups of people in cities. Also included is a discussion of which of these groups would be most seriously affected if all Federal housing assistance were to disappear. Harking back to the U. S. Housing Act of 1949, this chapter tries to delineate those groups for whom the promise of "a decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family" remains unfulfilled and for whom declining Federal aid threatens to further reduce the likelihood of its fulfillment.

In the third chapter of the report, the topic is the evaluation of current Federal housing programs: which programs are most "cost-effective" in meeting housing needs in cities?

Chapter IV examines city officials' assessments of the relative importance of a series of housing-related activities in meeting housing needs. These activities are not specific programs, but rather types of programs (e.g. "construction of new multi-family units" or "weatherization").

In Chapter V, the discussion moves to Federal policy again, this time focusing on the activities which would be important to emphasize if Federal housing assistance were completely revised and adequately funded.

The emphasis in these chapters is on straightforward reporting of cities' answers to the survey questions. Descriptions of the 444 responding cities, the sample selection, and the total response frequencies to questions on the survey are provided in the Appendices.

CHAPTER II

PEOPLE WHO FACE HOUSING PROBLEMS

The survey asked respondents to think about the difficulty that each of various groups of people face in finding decent and affordable housing. Then, from among these groups, respondents selected the three groups in their particular city that would be most in need of assistance in the absence of Federal aid. This chapter reports the answers that the 444 responding cities gave to these questions.

1) Assessments of Groups' Housing Problems

The survey presented a list of twelve groups and asked respondents to assess the housing problems experienced by each as "severe," "moderate," or "few". (The groups are not mutually exclusive segments of a city's population; these are overlapping categories.) Table II-1 shows the percentages of cities which gave each assessment to each group.

In this table and other similar tables throughout the report, a fourth column is included on the far right, showing the number of responses to this particular question. It is this number which is the basis for calculations of percentages in each row. In the category of recent immigrants, for example, only 299 cities chose to provide an assessment; the remainder either left the question blank or said that it was "not applicable" to their city. The table indicates 33.1 percent of cities view immigrant's problems as

"severe"; this is not 33.1 percent of all of the 444 cities in the survey, but rather 33.1 percent of the 299 cities which offered an opinion on this group.

TABLE II-1

SEVERITY OF PROBLEMS FOR VARIOUS GROUPS

Group	Severe	Moderate	Few	Number of Respondents (= 100%)
Homeless	58.0%	31.2%	10.8%	388
Low-Income Renters	53.4	40.5	6.1	440
Low-Income Homeowners	39.6	51.0	9.4	437
Families with 3 or More Children	39.1	47.1	13.8	435
Female-headed Households	36.3	50.2	13.5	438
Recent Immigrants	33.1	43.8	23.1	299
Handicapped Persons	22.6	57.3	20.0	424
Elderly	21.1	59.0	19.9	437
Blacks	16.3	49.6	34.1	405
Hispanics	12.7	52.3	35.0	346
Young Couples	7.2	45.8	47.0	432
Single Persons	5.0	34.3	60.8	423

The table manifests some fairly clear results: two groups' housing problems were rated "severe" by a majority of cities. Fifty-eight percent of cities that rated the problems of the homeless called these problems "severe." Fifty-three percent of those who rated low-income renters labelled that group's problems "severe."

Between 30 and 40 percent of cities said that a second cluster of groups--low-income homeowners, families with three or more children, female headed households, and recent immigrants--face "severe" problems with housing.

Many of the groups which cities did not place in the "severe" category were rated as having "moderate" problems. In fact, all groups--with the notable exceptions of young couples and single persons--were designated as having at least "moderate" problems by more than 75 percent of cities.

Young couples and single persons stand out as those groups which cities considered to have "few" problems. Forty-seven percent placed young couples in this category, and 60.8 percent did so for single persons. In addition, fewer than 10 percent of cities indicated "severe" problems for either group.

It is important to note that the highest percentages of cities gave "severe" ratings to categories that pertain to income and to housing tenure type (no house, renter, owner). The remaining categories pertain to characteristics of the person or the household. City officials tend to associate serious housing problems with the household's status in the housing market rather than with the demographic characteristics of the people.

2) Severe Problems by Region and City Size

Using the "severe" ratings from Table II-1 as indicators of major housing problems, the analysis in this section disaggregates those ratings by geographical location and by city size.

Table II-2 shows the frequency of "severe" responses for each group among the four Census regions. (See Table 3 in Appendix A for a list of which states are in which regions.)

TABLE II-2

SEVERE PROBLEMS--BY REGION

Group	North East	South	North Central	West
Homeless	60.8%	56.7%	49.4%	64.4%
Low-Income Renters	67.5	52.1	46.2	51.4
Low-Income Homeowners	43.9	43.6	34.3	36.4
Families with 3 or More Children	59.5	33.6	31.1	38.0
Female-headed Households	47.0	35.2	28.8	36.7
Recent Immigrants	39.4	36.3	15.9	37.8
Handicapped Persons	31.3	20.3	19.2	22.4
Elderly	28.9	17.9	12.5	27.3
Blacks	23.0	20.3	12.5	9.8
Hispanics	25.4	10.3	8.3	9.6
Young Couples	13.1	5.0	4.0	8.3
Single Persons	8.4	5.8	4.0	1.9

For all groups (except the homeless), cities in the Northeast are more likely than cities elsewhere to consider problems to be "severe." North Central cities, on the other hand, are less likely to label problems "severe" for almost all groups.

In terms of the order of groups in the ranking, however, there are few dramatic differences among the regional assessments of severe problems. In all four regions, first, the homeless, and second, low-income renters, were most frequently thought to experience "severe" problems. For both of these groups, 46 percent or more of respondents in each region rated their problems "severe."

Somewhat more variation in regional emphasis occurs within the subsequent cluster consisting of low-income homeowners, large families, female-headed households, and recent immigrants. Nearly 60 percent of Northeast cities said large families had severe problems while 38 percent or fewer respondents made the same assessment in each of the other regions. Only 15.9 percent of North Central cities said immigrant problems were severe, but the comparable figure is more than double in the other three regions.

For a subset of the groups, it is interesting to take a look at these kinds of differences, not only among regions but also among the nine Census divisions. Table II-3 compares the percentages of "severe" responses for low-income renters, large families, female-headed households, and recent immigrants. (See Table 3 in Appendix A for a list of which states are in which Census division.)

TABLE II-3

SELECTED SEVERE PROBLEMS, BY DIVISION

Division	Low Income Renters	Large Families	Famale-headed Households	Recent Immigrants
New England	74.3%	71.4%	71.4%	48.0%
Mid Atlantic	62.5	51.0	29.2	34.1
E. No. Central	48.6	31.9	27.8	16.7
W. No. Central	40.6	29.0	31.3	19.0
So. Atlantic	60.6	44.6	40.9	39.4
E. So. Central	38.5	16.0	34.6	9.1
W. So. Central	49.0	26.5	28.6	40.0
Mountain	28.1	32.3	22.6	24.0
Pacific	60.0	41.0	41.8	42.4
Total	53.4	39.1	36.3	33.1

The two divisions in the Northeast still show the highest numbers, with New England showing figures of over 70 percent for three of these groups.

The table suggests a general pattern of more severe problems for these groups in cities in the New England, Mid Atlantic, South Atlantic, and Pacific divisions. In these four areas, at least 60 percent of responding cities thought low-income renters had severe problems, while the remaining five divisions showed figures of less than 50 percent. Similarly, for large families, these four divisions had a minimum of 41 percent "severe" responses, and the other five had a maximum of 32.3 percent. Although the Mid-Atlantic shows an especially low figure (29.2%) for female-headed households facing "severe" problems, New England, the Pacific, and the South Atlantic remain the highest in this category.

In addition, the last column of the table clarifies the composition of the 33.1 percent of the respondents calling recent immigrants' problems "severe." The highest percentages of respondents are from cities in the New England, Mid-Atlantic, South Atlantic, West South Central, and Pacific divisions. Most of these areas contain significant sections of border or coastline. In the West, South Central division, which includes Texas, more cities said problems were severe for recent immigrants than for female-headed households or large families.

Table II-4 presents the percentages of cities that indicated "severe" problems for groups, separated according to population size of the cities.

In every case but one (young couples), a greater percentage of large cities indicated "severe" problems for each group than did small cities. However, certain problems--those of the homeless and low-income renters-- are most frequently designated "severe" by all cities, regardless of their size. In fact, the descending order of "severe" problems is roughly the same in all three size groups.

Generally, the figures for the medium-sized city respondents are roughly 5-10 percent lower than those for large cities, and the figures for small cities are again 5-10 percent lower than the medium-sized cities. Unlike the larger cities, medium and small cities more frequently rated the problems of low-income renters, large families, recent immigrants, and others as "moderate" rather than "severe".

One additional point to note is the relatively high number of large cities, nearly 40 percent, which thought that the handicapped confront severe problems finding adequate housing. By contrast, only 22.5 percent in medium-sized cities and 17.6 percent in small cities made this same judgment.

TABLE II-4

SEVERE PROBLEMS--BY POPULATION

Group	Small (Less than 50,000)	Medium (50,000-200,000	Large (Over 200,000)
Homeless	47.7%	62.9%	64.2%
Low-Income Renters	44.9	55.5	69.8
Low-Income Homeowners	39.1	38.4	46.2
Families with 3 or More Children	28.6	43.4	50.9
Female-Headed Households	30.1	38.0	47.2
Recent Immigrants	24.0	35.4	45.2
Handicapped Persons	17.6	22.5	38.8
Elderly	16.8	22.7	26.4
Blacks	11.7	17.9	22.9
Hispanics	8.1	13.0	26.3
Young Couples	7.0	8.0	3.9
Single Persons	3.3	3.2	17.6

Focusing on the small cities in the survey, we can divide this group into the 105 cities entitled to CDBG funding and the 54 which are not entitled. Few major differences emerge and these are displayed in Table II-5.

TABLE II-5

SEVERE PROBLEMS--ENTITLEMENT VS. NON-ENTITLEMENT SMALL CITIES

Groups	Entitlement	Non-entitlement
Homeless	43.7%	55.8%
Low-Income Renters	40.4	53.7
Low-Income Homeowners	36.9	43.4
Female-Headed Households	32.7	25.0
Families with 3 or More Children	31.1	23.5

The nonentitlement communities indicate severe problems for the first three groups--homeless, low-income renters, and low-income homeowners--with somewhat greater frequency than the entitlements. The case is reversed in assessments of the problems of female-headed households and large families.

In general, however, the order of the rankings are the same for both sets of cities and the magnitudes of the percentages are roughly similar. The severity of housing problems, as perceived by small city officials, is about the same regardless of whether the city does or does not have CDBG entitlement status.

When data from large cities are compared with additional data from urban counties, the evaluations of problems in the two types of jurisdictions (both with populations over 200,000) look similar.

For almost every group, the percentage of urban counties which calls its problems "severe" is slightly higher than the corresponding percentage of large cities. Table II-6 presents these comparisons for the five groups which were labelled "severe" by more than 50 percent of either the cities or counties. The percentages are based upon responses from the 53 large cities and the 47 urban counties that returned questionnaires.

TABLE II-6

SEVERE PROBLEMS--LARGE CITIES VS. URBAN COUNTIES

Groups	Large Cities	Urban Counties
Low-Income Renters	69.8%	72.3%
Homeless	64.2	69.6
Families with 3 or More Children	50.9	57.8
Female-Headed Households	47.2	68.1
Low-Income Homeowners	46.2	51.1

With the exception of a 20 point difference between 47.2 percent of large cities and 68.1 percent of counties that call problems "severe" for female-headed households, the large cities and urban counties have made roughly similar assessments of the problems these groups face.

3) A Note on the Data

The assessments of problems presented in the above tables and in the rest of this chapter reflect the judgments of knowledgeable city officials. These are perceptual data, not "hard" descriptions

of conditions (although the respondents are probably acquainted with such information about their cities). These perceptions are very important because they are offered by decision-makers and, thus, most likely have a degree of influence on policy. The respondents also are in a position to provide insights about actual local conditions beyond the gloss of statistics.

On the other hand, variations within the data presented here may also reflect differences in the propensity to see problems as "severe", as well as differences in the nature of those problems. Overall, 72.3 percent of the 444 responding cities reported that four or less of the groups have "severe" problems; 27.7 percent of the cities said that five or more groups have "severe" problems. Focusing on the latter figure, Table II-7 shows the extent to which regional and population size groupings of respondents vary from this national average.

Among the regions, 36.9 percent of Northeast cities reported that five or more groups have "severe" problems. This figure is 9.2 percentage points above the national average of 27.7. At the other extreme, North Central cities are 9.6 percentage points below the average. Northeast cities, then, are much more likely to report many (five or more) "severe" problems than are North Central cities.

Among population size groupings, large cities (17.5 percentage points above the average) are much more likely than medium-sized cities (3.3 percentages above the average) and small cities (10.7 points below the average) to report many "severe" problems.

Do these differences reflect variations in housing problems or do they reflect variation in peoples' standards of evaluation? Or, what mixture of these two bases of variation do the data reflect? The short answer is that we do not know. Another answer is that some variation in standards of evaluation seems likely and the reader should be careful not to put too much emphasis on relatively

small (say, less than 10 percent) differences among groups of cities. The most interesting answer, however, is that standards are a crucial element in determining the nature of problems and that, therefore, these informed perceptions are very strong indicators of local housing realities. The analyses here take into account the former caveats, but are mainly rooted in this latter view.

TABLE II-7

PERCENTAGES OF CITIES THAT REPORT 5 OR MORE "SEVERE" HOUSING PROBLEMS

	Percent of Cities	Number of Percentage Points Difference from National Average
National	27.7%	0
Northeast	36.9	+ 9.2
West	31.2	+ 3.5
South	26.6	- 1.1
North Central	18.1	- 9.6
Small	17.0	-10.7
Medium	31.0	+ 3.3
Large	45.2	+17.5

4) What Would Happen to These Groups if Federal Aid Disappeared?

The survey asked city officials to imagine a scenario in which all Federal housing assistance has disappeared. Table II-8 shows the frequency with which each group was indicated as a city's first, second, or third neediest in this hypothetical situation of no Federal housing aid.

The group that would suffer most from the disappearance of Federal aid is clearly low-income renters. Seventy-six percent of the cities indicated this group among their top three choices, and 40 percent made it their first choice.

TABLE II-8

NEEDIEST GROUPS IF FEDERAL AID ENDS

Group	1st, 2nd or 3rd Choice
Low-Income Renters	76.1% of Cities
Elderly	47.3
Female-Headed Households	40.3
Families with 3 or more Children	39.0
Low-Income Homeowners	35.1
Homeless	22.5
Handicapped	8.8
Blacks	6.8
Young Couples	4.7
Recent Immigrants	3.8
Hispanics	3.2
Single Persons	2.3
Other	2.7
No Response	7.5

After low-income renters (76.1%), the elderly (47.3%), and large families (39.0%), female-headed households (40.3%), and low-income owners (35.1%) are most frequently mentioned. The homeless are mentioned by 22.5 percent of respondents, and the other groups are mentioned by fewer than 10 percent.

These responses involved several different judgments by city officials who answered. First, what is the relative degree of housing need among the groups? This is similar to the views expressed in the data in Table II-1, but here the groups' needs are being ranked whereas, in the previous question, each group's needs were assessed independently. Second, to what extent are these groups now aided by Federal programs such that loss of the programs would affect the group directly?

The effect of this second judgment is most clearly seen in the reversal of the place in the rankings given to the elderly and the homeless in Table II-8 compared to Table II-1. The elderly are now aided by Federal programs in many cities and, thus, the loss of such programs would increase the housing problems the elderly face. Federal programs apparently are seen as benefitting homeless persons in fewer cities and, thus the loss of aid would affect them less. This results in the lower place given them in Table II-8.

TABLE II-9

NEEDIEST GROUPS IF FEDERAL AID ENDS--BY REGION

	North East	South	North Central	West
Low-Income Renters	77.4%	78.3%	75.2%	73.2%
Elderly	38.1	44.1	49.5	56.3
Female-Headed Households	29.8	39.9	44.8	44.6
Families with 3 or More Children	52.4	37.1	39.0	31.3
Low-Income Homeowners	29.8	40.6	37.1	30.4
Homeless	22.6	21.0	21.9	25.0

In every region, over 70 percent of cities indicated that low-income renters would be most in need if Federal aid ends. (See Table II-9.) Some variation in emphasis did occur, however, regarding the other groups. The elderly were most frequently a choice in the West (56.3%) and least often in the Northeast (38.1%). The Northeast cities were more likely than cities in other regions to select large families (52.4%) and less likely to select femaleheaded households (29.8%). In all four regions, the homeless were selected as most needy by only 20-25 percent of the cities.

Table II-10 presents a breakdown of the data in Table II-8 by population size. All three size groups agree (with percentages greater than 70 percent) that low-income renters would suffer most if Federal aid were terminated.

TABLE II-10

NEEDIEST GROUPS IF FEDERAL AID ENDS--BY POPULATION

	Small	Medium	Large
Low-Income Renters	74.2	76.7	79.2
Elderly	49.1	49.1	34.0
Female-Headed Households	37.7	40.9	45.3
Families with 3 or More Children	38.4	38.4	43.4
Low-Income Homeowners	43.4	31.0	28.3
Homeless	17.6	23.7	32.1

Small and medium-sized cities follow similar patterns, with the exception of a relatively greater emphasis on low-income homeowners in the small cities (43.4%). The large cities tended to choose both female-headed households (45.3%) and families with three or more children (43.4%) more frequently than the elderly (34.0%).

CHAPTER III

ASSESSMENTS OF FEDERAL HOUSING PROGRAMS

This chapter reports on the findings from survey questions that asked city officials about 1) their capacity to replace Federal funds for housing assistance, 2) how they rate 21 specific Federal housing programs as to "cost-effectiveness" and 3) which of these 21 Federal housing programs are the "most cost-effective". Breakdowns of these data by region and population size are presented, as appropriate.

City officials say that, as Federal housing aid declines, neither their city nor any other source will replace the lost funds for housing assistance to poor people.

Regarding Federal housing programs, cities that have some experience with them tend to rate them as cost-effective. Of 21 specific Federal programs that are evaluated in the survey, from 85 percent to 23 percent of cities that have a basis for judgment about each program say that it is "highly cost-effective". The greatest percentages of cities rated the Community Development Block Grant Program (84.7 percent) and the Section 8 Existing Housing Certificates (69.3 percent) as "highly cost-effective".

When asked to name the three "most cost-effective" Federal housing aid programs, by far the greatest proportions of cities include CDBG (73.0 percent) and Section 8 Existing Certificates (47.1) among their three choices. No other program received votes from more than 30 percent of the cities. The wide scattering of cities' votes for this third "most cost-effective program" clearly

suggests that the effectiveness of programs is related to their appropriateness in given situations and that a variety of Federal aid programs is necessary to deal with the variety of housing situations in different cities.

1. Would other funds be found if Federal housing assistance were terminated?

In two separate ways, the survey asked city officials to indicate whether, in the absence of Federal aid, funds would be found to provide needed housing assistance. The question was asked first with regard to meeting the needs of groups that would be most in need of assistance if Federal aid disappeared and second, with regard to replacement of funds for programs that the city rates as most cost-effective.

As reported in Chapter II, the survey asked which three groups of people would be most in need of assistance if all Federal aid programs were terminated. Following that question, we asked whether, without Federal aid, the city could provide half or more of the assistance that these groups would need over the next five years. Four percent or less of the cities said that they would be able to provide half or more of the assistance needed.

The survey also asked cities to select the three "most cost-effective" Federal housing aid programs. (Details on these responses are provided later in this chapter.) For each of those three "most cost-effective" programs, we asked whether funding would likely be replaced from other sources if Federal aid were terminated. Two percent or less of the cities said that more than half of the funding for any of those three "most cost-effective" programs would be replaced from other sources. From 10 to 15 percent of the respondents said that something less than half of the funding would be replaced from other sources. From 83 to 88 percent of the respondents said that there would be "little or no replacement".

2. Assessments of 21 Federal Housing Aid Programs

The survey provided a list of 21 specific Federal housing aid programs. Respondents were asked to evaluate the "cost-effectiveness" of each program individually. The question read as follows:

> "Please assess the value of each of the Federal programs listed below. For each dollar spent on each program in your jurisdiction, which programs produced a relatively great benefit in meeting the housing needs of poor people in your city? Which show less effectiveness (or 'bang for the buck')? Suggestion: Imagine that your jurisdiction spends the same amount on each program and compare the programs according to the benefits they produce."

The question was posed this way to encourage respondents to ignore the sheer size of a program (the larger the program in money terms, the greater the impact) and to focus instead on the per dollar benefit. Respondents could rate the program as "highly cost-effective", "moderately cost-effective", or "not cost-effective". Or, respondents could indicate that this program was "not applicable" in their city and/or that they had "no basis for judgment in this jurisdiction". The results of this question are presented in Table III-1.

TABLE III-1

ASSESSMENTS OF 21 FEDERAL PROGRAMS

	Highly cost-effective; great benefit for each dollar spent	Moderately cost-effective; moderate benefit for each dollar spent	Not cost-effective; little benefit per dollar	Number of Respondents (N)
a. CDBG	84.7%	13.8%	1.5%	412
b. Section 8 - Existing Housing	69.3	29.0	1.7	411
c. Urban Development Action Grant Program	62.1	29.4	8.5	153
d. Rental Rehabilitation Grants	61.2	30.6	8.3	327
e. Public Housing Modernization Program	58.6	37.5	3.9	256
f. Public Housing Operating Subsidy Program	55.7	40.3	4.0	273
g. Section 202 (Elderly and Handicapped)	55.5	41.3	3.2	283
h. Section 8 - Rehabilitation Housing	48.6	44.4	7.0	286
i. HoDAG	45.1	46.2	8.8	91
j. Housing Vouchers	44.7	48.2	7.1	226
k. Farmers Home Administration Homeownership Program (Section 502)	44.6	37.5	17.9	56
l. Multi-family IDBs	43.7	45.9	10.4	183

	Highly cost-effective; great benefit for each dollar spent	Moderately cost-effective; moderate benefit for each dollar spent	Not cost-effective; little benefit per dollar	Number of Respondents (N)
m. Low-Income Public Housing Program (Construction)	43.6	44.7	11.7	257
n. Single Family MRBs	42.0	46.0	12.1	174
o. Rehabilitation Loan Program (Section 312)	41.5	43.8	14.7	265
p. FmHA Rural Rental Housing Program (Section 515)	40.6	43.8	15.6	32
q. Flexible Subsidy Program (Troubled Public Housing Projects	40.0	43.6	16.4	55
r. Urban Homesteading Program	36.6	43.0	20.4	93
s. Section 8 - Newly Constructed Housing	32.8	50.2	17.0	271
t. Section 236 (Multi-family Rental)	25.9	60.4	13.7	197
u. Section 235 and 235 Revised (Single-Family)	23.4	61.7	14.9	188
v. Other (Specifiy) _____	85.0	15.0	0.0	20

Two caveats are important for understanding these responses. First, since respondents had the option of saying that the program was "not applicable" in their city, the number of cities evaluating each program varies. The percentage of respondents who say, for example, that a given program is "highly cost-effective" is the percentage of those who evaluated that program, not the percentage of the total of 444 cities who responded to the overall survey. This approach makes it more likely that the judgments reported here are based on reasonably full information about each program. The number of respondents on which the percentages are based for each program is provided in the last column of Table III-1. In a few cases, that number is so small that the findings should be treated very tentatively.

The second caveat that the reader should note is that respondents to this question were evaluating each program separately; that is, they were not asked here to rank the programs as to their cost-effectiveness, but rather to use the same benefit per dollar criteria in evaluating each program separately. (A subsequent question in the survey, reported below, asked the respondents to rank the top three programs.)

There is clearly a tendency among the city respondents to give favorable marks to programs that they have experience with. All of the programs received either a "highly cost-effective" or a "moderately cost-effective" rating in huge majorities of the cities. No program received more "not cost-effective" ratings then "highly cost-effective" ratings. No more than 20 percent of the cities rated any program "not cost-effective".

Table III-1 also shows that from 10 to 20 percent of the responding cities view 11 of the 21 programs as "not cost-effective". All of these 11 programs also receive less than majority "highly cost-effective" ratings, but the two rankings are not precisely

inversely related. (Disaggregating these data by region or city size proves not to be useful, because the numbers in each cell of the breakdowns are too small to be a basis for reliable analysis.)

Seven of the twenty-one programs received "highly cost-effective" ratings from a majority or more of the respondents. Those seven programs are:

CDBG	84.7%
Section 8 Existing Housing	69.3%
UDAG Programs	62.1%
Rental Rehabilitation Grants	61.2%
Public Housing Modernization	58.6%
Public Housing Operating Subsidy	55.7%
Section 202 (Elderly and Handicapped)	55.5%

Tables III-2 and III-3 break down the "highly cost-effective" ratings for these seven programs, by city size and by region. As to variations by population, cities under 50,000 are slightly less likely to give "highly cost-effective" ratings than cities over 50,000. As to regional variations, cities in the South and especially in the West are distinctly less favorable to the UDAG program than cities in the Northeast and North Central. (These judgments reflect the regional differences in UDAG awards over the last few years, since the amount of total grant applications began to exceed the amounts of money available under the UDAG program.)

TABLE III-2

"HIGHLY COST-EFFECTIVE" PROGRAMS, BY CITY SIZE

	Total	Less Than 50,000	50,000 - 200,000	Over 200,000
a. CDBG	84.7%	82.4%	86.7%	82.4%
b. Section 8 Existing	69.3	62.5	73.5	69.2
c. UDAG	62.1	56.8	67.1	58.3
d. Rental Rehab Grants	61.2	64.2	58.6	64.7
e. Public Housing Modernization	58.6	50.6	62.7	62.8
f. Public Housing Operating Subsidy	55.7	49.5	59.3	58.1
g. Section 202	55.5	52.3	58.1	53.2

TABLE III-3

"HIGHLY COST-EFFECTIVE" PROGRAMS, BY REGION

	Total	North East	South	North Central	West
a. CDBG	84.7%	85.9%	85.6%	83.7%	83.7%
b. Section 8 Existing	69.3	70.0	71.9	65.7	69.2
c. UDAG	62.1	73.9	57.7	69.7	36.4
d. Rental Rehab Grants	61.2	63.3	63.4	64.2	52.7
e. Public Housing Modernization	58.6	51.7	65.7	58.5	50.0
f. Public Housing Operating Subsidy	55.7	59.3	54.2	55.9	54.2
g. Section 202	55.5	50.0	61.7	48.0	59.1

Also, Southern cities are more likely to give high ratings to the public housing modernization program than are cities in the Northeast and the West. This Southern emphasis on the public housing program will reappear in data presented later in the report.

Overall, however, the effect of Tables III-2 and III-3 is to exhibit the relative consensus of the cities, across regions and across population sizes, on assessments of these seven programs. In short, the degree of regional and population size variation is not very great.

The data also allow us to compare, within the category of cities with populations under 50,000, the views of small cities that are entitled to CDBG and those that are not. This comparison is presented for the same seven Federal programs in Table III-4. While entitlement small cities are more likely to give high ratings to the CDBG program than non-entitlement small cities, the percentage of the latter is still very high: 72.2 percent. Furthermore, compared with entitlement small cities, non-entitlement small cities are less likely to give "highly cost-effective" ratings to the Section 8 Program (50.0 to 67.3 percent), Rental Rehab Grants (45.5 to 69.9 percent), and the Public Housing Operating Subsidy program (37.9 to 54.5 percent). On the other hand, non-entitlement small cities are more enthusiastic about the UDAG program (66.7 percent) than are entitlement small cities (51.7 percent).

TABLE III-4

"HIGHLY COST-EFFECTIVE" PROGRAMS, SMALL CITIES

	Small Entitled	Small Not Entitled
a. CDBG	86.0%	72.2%
b. Section 8 Existing	67.3	50.0
c. UDAG	51.7	66.7
d. Rental Rehab Grants	69.9	45.5
e. Public Housing Modernization	51.6	47.8
f. Public Housing Operating Subsidy	54.5	37.9
g. Section 202	54.1	48.1

Another comparison of interest is between large cities (those with populations of over 200,000) and urban counties (defined as CDBG entitlement counties with populations over 200,000). (The urban county data is **not** a part of the totals presented in previous tables. The county data is used here to provide comparison to the large city data.) As shown in Table III-5, urban counties are slightly less likely to give the highest effectiveness rating to CDBG. Urban counties are dramatically less favorable to UDAG, Public Housing Moderization and the Rental Rehabilitation Grant programs than are large cities. On the other hand, urban counties are somewhat more favorable to Section 8 Existing Certificates and the Section 202 program than are large cities.

III-5

"HIGHLY COST-EFFECTIVE" PROGRAMS, LARGE CITY/URBAN COUNTY COMPARISONS

	Large Cities (Over 200,000)	Urban Counties
a. CDBG	82.4%	72.3%
b. Section 8 Existing	69.2	76.1
c. UDAG	58.3	20.0
d. Rental Rehab Grants	64.7	45.2
e. Public Housing Modernization	62.8	38.5
f. Public Housing Operating Subsidy	58.1	51.9
g. Section 202	53.2	65.0

3) Ranking Federal programs: the three "most cost-effective"

The survey asked respondents to choose (from the same 21 programs in the list reported in the previous section) the first, second, and third "most cost-effective" programs. In the previous question, respondents were asked to try to use a single standard of evaluation for each of the programs, but the question did not ask the respondent to indicate any comparison or ranking among the programs. In this question, however, each respondent could designate no more than three of the programs as being "most cost-effective". From the previous question, therefore, we get a ranking based on the percentage of cities that said a given program was "highly cost-effective": the ranking was implicit in the

multiple answers to the question. In this question, the ranking is explicit: each city respondent chose three programs, at most, and thus did not choose the other 18.

For purposes of analysis, then, the most significant arrangement of the responses to this question is the percentage of cities that chose each program as either their first, second, or third "most cost-effective" selection. This analysis assumes that the most significant distance between the programs in the ranking is the distance between the first, second, and third on the one hand, (i.e., the three programs that were chosen by the respondent) and all the others, on the other hand (i.e., all the other programs that were not selected as first, second, or third "most cost-effective").

Table III-6 presents the frequencies for this aggregated set of responses.

Far and away the cities' top choice as the "most cost-effective" Federal program for housing assistance is the Community Development Block Grant program. CDBG received either the first, second or third choice vote of 73 percent of the 444 cities responding to the survey. Just as clearly, the second "most cost-effective" Federal housing program, according to these 444 cities, is the Section 8 Existing Housing Certificate Program: 47.1 percent of the cities gave this program either their first, second, or third choice. The percentages of cities that rate the next two programs as one of their "most cost-effective" are very close: 27.9 percent for the Rental Rehabilitation Grants and 23.7 percent for the programs that

TABLE III-6

		% of Cities Selecting Items as First, Second, or Third Choice
a.	CDBG	73.0%
b.	Section 8 - Existing Housing	47.1
c.	Rental Rehabilitation Grants	27.9
d.	Public Housing Operating Subsidy and/or Modernization Programs	23.7
e.	Section 202 (Elderly and Handicapped)	14.6
f.	Section 8 - Rehabilitation Housing	12.4
g.	Low-Income Public Housing Program (Construction)	12.2
h.	Urban Development Action Grant Program	11.0
i.	Section 8 - Newly Constructed Housing	10.4
j.	Rehabilitation Loan Program (Section 312)	9.2
k.	Multi-family IDBs	7.0
l.	Single Family MRBs	5.2
m.	Housing Vouchers	5.0
n.	Section 235 and 235 Revised (Single-Family)	2.9
o.	Urban Homesteading Program	2.7
p.	Section 236 (Multi-family Rental)	2.5
q.	HoDAG	2.0
r.	Farmers Home Administration Homeownership Program (Section 502)	1.1
s.	Flexible Subsidy Program (Troubled Public Housing Projects)	0.9
t.	FmHA Rural Rental Housing Program (Section 515)	0.9
u.	Other (Specify) _____	1.6

address the maintenance and improvement of the existing stock of public housing.*

The remainder of the cities' votes for first, second and third "most cost-effective" programs are spread across all of the rest of the programs. None of these other programs received the votes of more than 15 percent of the cities.

This assessment by cities produces a striking consensus on the top two "most cost-effective" programs and it also demonstrates a wide spread of opinion regarding the primacy of all of the remaining programs in the list. Three out of four cities agree on the primary importance of CDBG; almost two out of four cities agree on the importance of Section 8. But less than about one out of four cities agree on the primacy of any other program: different cities see different programs as the "most cost-effective" for their community. The latter finding reflects the same spread of opinion, the same view that different programs are effective in different situations, that we found in the data reported in the previous section (see Table III-1) and that will be presented in Chapter IV.

---

*The category of "Operating and/or Modernization" for Public Housing is actually a combination of two programs that are listed separately in the survey questionnaire (see Appendix B.) The rationale for the combination is that these are really two aspects of the effort to maintain and improve the public housing stock and, thus, may be considered one "program". (New construction of public housing might also have been combined to create a whole "public housing program" category, but, it seemed reasonable to distinguish between new construction and the existing stock of public housing for these purposes.) Table III-6 reports that 23.7 percent of the 444 responding cities selected either Operating Subsidy or Modernization or both of them as one of their three "most cost-effective" programs. The later classifications by region and city size are based on the same data analysis.

The clear-cut selection of the top two "most cost-effective" programs suggests that either these provide enough flexibility and local control to be able to address the problems of many localities (CDBG), or they are targeted to exactly a set of problems that are shared by many localities (Section 8 Existing is a direct rent assistance program). Analysis of this finding will be further illuminated by data in the next chapter regarding the housing assistance activities that cities think are most important.

The top ranking given to these two programs and the wide spread of the other votes among an array of Federal programs are patterns that consistently appear even when the data is broken down by region and by population size. Table III-7 presents these regional and population size breakdowns for the top four programs in Table III-6. Looking down the columns of the table, there is no variation of much more than 15 percent among the regions or among the size groups. Furthermore, there are only two cases where (reading across the rows of Table III-7) the order of the four programs changes: in the South and in large cities, greater percentages of officials rate the public housing stock programs higher than the Rental Rehabilitation program.

There are, nonetheless, several variations of interest in Table III-7. As to CDBG, small cities are slightly less likely to see the program as one of their "most cost-effective", but two out of three say that it is. Non-entitlement small cities (which are included in the "small city" category here; see also Table III-9) are distinctly less enthusiastic about CDBG than are entitlement small cities. The same pattern holds for small cities' view of Section 8. Small cities and Western cities are less inclined than other cities to rate the Rental Rehabilitation program highly.

The greatest emphasis on the public housing stock (operating and modernization programs) comes from large cities and Southern cities, where that stock is most concentrated.

TABLE III-7

MOST COST-EFFECTIVE PROGRAMS
BY REGION AND CITY POPULATION

	CDBG	Section 8 Existing	Rental Rehab	Oper./Mod. Public Housing
Total	73.0%	47.1%	27.9%	23.7%
Region				
Northeast	78.6	53.6	32.1	21.4
South	69.9	42.7	27.3	33.6
North Central	72.4	42.9	33.3	21.0
West	73.2	51.8	20.5	15.2
Population				
Less than 50,000	66.7	38.4	30.8	22.0
50,000 - 200,000	77.2	53.9	27.2	22.8
Over 200,000	73.6	43.4	22.6	32.1

Two other comparisons are useful here (although the public housing program data are not available for these tables.) First, Table III-8 compares the responses from large cities (those over 200,000 in population) with a separate data set from urban counties. Although urban counties are slightly more likely to rank Section 8 Existing as one of their three "most cost-effective" programs than large cities (51.1 percent to 43.4 percent, respectively), the percentages are virtually the same for urban counties as for large cities with regard to CDBG and the Rental Rehabilitation program.

TABLE III-8

MOST COST-EFFECTIVE PROGRAMS
LARGE CITY/URBAN COUNTY COMPARISON

	CDBG	Section 8 Existing	Rental Rehab
Large Cities	73.6	43.4	22.6
Urban Counties	70.2	51.1	25.5

A second additional comparison is between small cities (under 50,000 population) that are entitled to receive CDBG funds and those that are not entitled (and that, therefore, may only participate in the discretionary, usually state-run, small cities CDBG programs). This comparison is presented in Table III-9. Entitlement small cities exhibit percentages that are very much like larger cities for each of the three programs.

TABLE III-9

MOST COST-EFFECTIVE PROGRAMS, SMALL CITIES

	CDBG	Section 8 Existing	Rental Rehab
Small Cities-Total	66.7	38.4	30.8
Entitlement	80.9	41.8	37.1
Non-Entitlement	38.9	31.5	18.6

Non-entitlement small cities, on the other hand, are far less likely to rank any of these three programs as one of their three most cost-effective. Nonetheless, their relative rankings (that is, which program comes in first, second, and third) are the same as for entitlement small cities and for cities overall.

The nonentitlement small cities also differ from all other cities in that 28.6 percent of the possible votes for first, second or third "most cost-effective" programs were not used. That is, in 28.6 percent of their opportunities to identify a first, second or third "most cost-effective" program, non-entitlement small cities did not make a selection.* The comparable percentage for the total sample of 444 cities is 7.8 percent. These results may tell us that--faced with a request to highlight specific programs--these city officials say that relatively few of the Federal aid programs provide outstandingly cost-effective housing assistance to their communities.

---

* This high "no answer" rate is specific to this question. The "no answer" rates are much lower for questions that appear later in the survey questionnaire.

CHAPTER IV

WHAT TYPES OF HOUSING ASSISTANCE ACTIVITIES ARE NEEDED?

Putting aside the particular characteristics of current housing assistance programs, what types of activities do city officials think are needed in order to alleviate the housing problems of poor people? This chapter reports on the answers given to this question by the 444 responding cities. In sum, the activities that are "very important" in the largest proportion of cities are housing rehabilitation for both single and multi-family units and direct money aid to low-income renters. In addition, substantial proportions of cities say that many different housing assistance activities are "very important" in addressing the housing needs of poor people.

These two findings--the consensus on the importance of rehabilitation and rental assistance and an array of other housing assistance activities that are "very important" in the largest proportion of cities--are consistent with the findings reported in Chapter 3 regarding the cost effectiveness of Federal programs. That is, the emphases on various rehabilitation activities and on rental assistance are similar to the high ratings given to CDBG and Section 8 Existing Certificates. The spreads of emphasis across all other activities or programs are also similar. It seems likely that this pattern of responses is an underlying structure to the answers to the survey given by the 444 cities.

1) Assessments of the Need for Various Housing Assistance Activities

The survey asked city officials to think more generally about housing policy and programs; it asked them to think at the level of "activities" beyond the specific characteristics of Federal, state or local programs. The purpose of this set of questions was to get beyond the advantages and disadvantages of current or proposed programs and to deal more fundamentally with the issue of the kinds of approaches that are required to address low-income housing problems. The 444 responding cities gave some fairly clear answers to this fundamental question.

The survey listed 13 "activities" that "might alleviate the housing problems of poor people". One question asked the respondent to "indicate how important each of these activities would be in addressing the housing needs of low and moderate income households in your city . . . regardless of whether your city now has these activities". In other words, the respondents were being asked to sketch out the dimensions of a housing policy for their cities. It should be noted that the question has to do with the nature of activities that should be be undertaken; disregarded here is the issue of whether the funding and policy guidance for such activities comes from the Federal, state or local levels of government.

The list of 13 activities and the frequencies of the cities' responses are provided in Table IV-1. The 13 activities and the data are listed in declining order according to the frequency of responses to the "very important" rating.

The pattern of these assessments seems fairly clear. First, by far the greatest percentage of cities (79.9 percent) say that rental assistance (that is, direct money payments) would be a "very important activity" in addressing the housing needs of poor

TABLE IV-1

ACTIVITIES NEEDED TO ALLEVIATE LOW-INCOME HOUSING PROBLEMS

	Very Important	Moderately Important	Not Important	Number of Respondents (N)
a. Rental assistance (money payments)	79.9%	18.8%	1.4%	436
b. Rehabilitation of single-family homes	63.1	31.9	5.0	439
c. Rehab. of multi-family units (privately owned)	60.0	31.5	8.5	435
d. Construction of new multi-family units	44.5	38.7	16.7	431
e. Emergency repairs	42.4	47.5	10.1	434
f. Providing emergency shelters	40.6	41.3	18.1	414
g. Direct assistance to to help people own housing units	39.4	46.8	13.8	419
h. Construction of new public housing units	35.3	36.7	28.1	417
i. Rehab of public housing units	33.5	35.7	30.8	412
j. Weatherization	32.6	48.9	18.6	436
k. Site assembly	26.2	41.2	32.6	386
l. Construction of new single-family units	22.9	49.8	27.3	428
m. Fair housing programs	19.4	52.2	28.4	423

people in their cities. Second, at the next level down in terms of the percentage of cities giving a "very important" rating, are the two rehabilitation activities (single family--63.1 percent, multi-family--60 percent). Third, the remaining 10 activities were rated as "very important" by proportions of the responding cities ranging from 44.5 percent to 19.4 percent.

These three levels of the "very important" ratings fall quite simply from the data. That is, there is about a 16 percent drop in the percentage of cities between rental assistance and the next activity (single-family rehab). Then there is another 16 percent drop between the third-ranked activity and the fourth (that is, between multi-family rehab and multi-family new construction). There is no such large drop in the percentages at any other point in the remaining rankings of the activities.

There is a tendency for respondents in questions like this one to chose the middle term (in this case "moderately") if they are at all unsure about a judgment. Thus, it is interesting to look not only at the "very important" column, but also at the "not important" column where cities are saying that these activities would not be useful in addressing the housing needs of low and moderate income households in their cities. The analysis of the "very important" column is mirrored here: that is, less than 10 percent of the respondents said that rental assistance and single- and multi-family rehabilitation would be "not important". Percentages ranging from 10 to nearly 33 percent, however, said that the remaining 10 activities would be "not important". In only three cases, however, does the "not important" percentage exceed or approximate the "very important" percentage. Those three cases are: site assembly, construction of new single-family units, and fair housing programs. These contrasting views do not cancel each other out; the survey simply reveals that there are fewer cities

for which the activity is "very important" than there are for which it is "not important". The finding is a good illustration of the general point that local problems vary and, therefore, solutions must also vary.

The findings from Table IV-1 might be summarized again as follows. In eight out of ten cities, rental assistance would be important in the creation of an effective housing policy. In six out of ten cities, rehabilitation of single-family and multi-family units would be "very important". The ten other activities would be "very important" in smaller, but still substantial proportions of cities.

Notable for its absence from the top three activities is new construction of any sort. Although there are quite substantial percentages of cities that say that new multi-family construction (44.5 percent) and new public housing construction (35.3 percent) are "very important", new single-family construction is rated as "very important" in only 22.9 percent of cities. These findings cannot be used to conclude that new construction has no place in low-income housing policy, but they do suggest that rehabilitation is more broadly applicable than new construction. (A somewhat different analysis of related data, presented in Chapter V, combines new construction of both publicly- and privately-owned multi-family units.)

2) Assessments, by Region and City Size

The Tables IV-2 through IV-7 present breakdowns of the data presented in Table IV-1: by population, by region, for small cities (CDBG entitlement versus non-entitlement), and for comparison of large cities and urban county data.

Perhaps the most notable conclusion from analysis of these tables is that there is not indeed very much variation across regions and across city size groupings in cities' assessment of the relative

importance of these activities. While the following tables and text focus on specific and interesting variations that do exist, the reader should see these specific differences against the background of what appears to be a fairly solid consensus on most of the questions.

Table IV-2 presents the differences among small, medium and large cities. With regard to only 6 of the 13 activities, there is a difference (in the percent of small, medium or large cities that assess the activity as "very important") of more than 10 percentage points. The largest difference in this regard is that 64.7 percent of large cities say that rehabilitation of public housing units would be "very important", whereas only 28 and 29 percent of small and medium cities agree.

Roughly speaking, Table IV-2 shows that--in those cases where there is significant variation by city size--the nature of the variation is that, as city size increases, greater proportions of the cities say that each activity is "very important" for solving housing problems. Again, this finding must be seen in the context of the other major finding, which is that in the case of 7 of the 13 activities there is no significant variation by city size.

Table IV-3 focuses on the variations by city size in the negative assessments of the importance of the 13 activities: activities that cities report would not be important in alleviating low-income housing problems. In only 5 of the 13 cases is there significant variation (10 or more percentage points) among city size groupings. In two cases, these negative assessments mirror the patterns (in Table IV-2) of the "very important" ratings. Thus, large cities are much more inclined to say that providing emergency shelters and rehabilitation of public housing units are "very important" activities. Conversely, large cities are much less inclined then small or medium size cities to say that these are "not important".

TABLE IV-2

ACTIVITIES THAT WOULD BE "VERY IMPORTANT" TO ALLEVIATE LOW INCOME HOUSING PROBLEMS

BY POPULATION SIZE

	Small (Under 50,000)	Medium (50,000-200,000)	Large (Over 200,000)	Total (All Cities)
a. Rental assistance (money payments)	70.6%	83.5%	90.6%	79.8%
b. Rehabilitation of single-family homes	64.3	62.1	64.2	63.1
c. Rehab. of multi-family units (privately owned)	58.3	58.9	69.8	60.0
d. Construction of new multi-family units	38.2	46.7	53.8	44.5
e. Emergency repairs	36.8	45.4	45.3	42.4
f. Providing emergency shelters	32.7	43.3	52.0	40.6
g. Direct assistance to help people own housing units	41.1	35.7	50.0	39.4
h. Construction of new public housing units	31.5	36.9	39.2	35.3
i. Rehab of public housing units	28.1	29.8	64.7	33.5
j. Weatherization	31.8	33.5	30.8	32.6
k. Site assembly	23.7	27.5	27.1	26.2
l. Construction of new single-family units	22.1	23.9	20.8	22.9
m. Fair housing programs	20.8	17.3	24.5	19.4

TABLE IV-3

ACITIVITES THAT WOULD NOT BE IMPORTANT TO ALLEVIATE LOW INCOME HOUSING PROBLEMS

BY POPULATION SIZE
(VARIATIONS OF 10 OR MORE PERCENTAGE POINTS)

	Small	Medium	Large	Total
f. Providing emergency shelters	23.8%	16.1%	10.0%	18.1%
i. Rehab of public housing units	28.8	36.3	13.7	30.8
k. Site assembly	40.5	30.9	18.8	32.6
l. Construction of new single-family units	28.9	28.8	17.0	27.3
m. Fair housing programs	33.6	27.1	18.4	28.4

Regional variations in the "very important" responses are presented in Table IV-4. The greatest difference occurs with regard to weatherization: there is a 28.7 percent difference between cities in the West (at 17 percent) and those in the North Central region at (45.7 percent).

Looking at the general patterns in Table IV-4, we can say that Northeastern cities are more inclined then cities in other regions to say that any given housing activity is "very important" in solving low income housing problems; and that cities in the West are less inclined than those in the other regions to say this. While this generalization may help the reader and the analyst acquire an orientation toward the data in Table IV-4, it is important to say again that the degree of variation in some of these cases is quite small.

TABLE IV-4

ACTIVITIES THAT WOULD BE "VERY IMPORTANT" TO ALLEVIATE LOW INCOME HOUSING PROBLEMS

BY REGION

	North East	South	North Central	West	Total
a. Rental assistance (money payments)	81.9	77.9	80.0	80.6	79.8
b. Rehabilitation of single-family homes	49.4	75.2	71.4	50.0	63.1
c. Rehab. of multi-family units (privately owned)	67.5	52.1	68.0	56.9	60.0
d. Construction of new multi-family units	53.0	46.0	36.9	43.5	44.5
e. Emergency repairs	37.8	47.5	51.9	29.9	42.4
f. Providing emergency shelters	43.8	43.8	32.7	41.5	40.6
g. Direct assistance to help people own housing units	48.8	47.4	28.3	31.7	39.4
h. Construction of new public housing units	36.6	45.3	24.0	31.6	35.3
i. Rehab of public housing units	38.6	44.9	26.0	20.6	33.5
j. Weatherization	35.7	32.6	45.7	17.0	32.6
k. Site assembly	37.5	25.6	19.6	25.0	26.2
l. Construction of new single-family units	32.5	28.3	19.4	11.5	22.9
m. Fair housing programs	24.7	21.3	21.2	11.2	19.4

More interesting than these general regional tendencies are some of the specific differences that probably reflect the nature of housing problems among the regions. For example, there is a pattern in the differing mixes of rehabilitation needs in the four regions. With regard to single-family rehabilitation, three quarters of Southern and North Central cities say that it is "very important", but only half of Northeastern and Western cities say that it is "very important". On the other hand, with regard to multi-family units, 68 percent of cities in the Northeast and North Central regions say that it is "very important", while 52.1 and 56.9 percent of cities say this in the South and the West, respectively. To look at this mix in each of the regions it is necessary first, to remind ourselves that all of these percentages are significantly high. Keeping that clearly in mind, we can label the regions as "high" and "less high" as regards single-family or multi-family rehabilitation and obtain combinations as exhibited in Table-4a.

TABLE IV-4a

MIXES OF REHABILITAITON NEEDS, BY REGION

	High Multi-Family Rehab	**Less High Multi-Family Rehab**
High Single Rehab	North Central	South
Less High Single Rehab	North east	West

There is no national uniformity: each region--and indeed each city--has its own mix of rehabilitation needs. This lack of uniformity underlies the spread of "cost effectiveness" ratings (reported in Chapter III) and--in combination with the strong attraction of a program that allows much local autonomy--the very high degree of consensus on the value of CDBG.

Table IV-5 presents the regional variation of the "not important" ratings. It presents data only for those activities where the variation is 10 or more percentage points among the regions. As with the population variations, to some extent these negative ratings are the mirror image of the "very important" ratings. Thus, for example, the North Central and Western cities give significantly higher percentages of "not important" ratings to rehabilitation of public housing units (40.6 and 46.4 percent respectively), and they give significantly lower percentages of "very important" ratings (26.0 and 20.6 percent respectively in Table IV-4). The opposite pattern is mirrored in the two tables for the Northeast and the South regarding rehabilitation of public housing units. Similarly, the North Central and Western cities give higher percentages of "not important" ratings to construction of new single-family units than do the Northeast and South and this mirrors the lower North Central and Western percentages of "very important" ratings for that activity.

Regarding emergency shelters, the percentages found in both Table IV-4 and IV-5 show virtual unanimity among the Northeast, South and West. The North Central cities are less likely to say that providing emergency shelters is "very important" and correspondingly they are more likely to say that it is "not important".

TABLE IV-5

ACTIVITIES THAT WOULD NOT BE IMPORTANT TO ALLEVIATE LOW INCOME HOUSING PROBLEMS

BY REGION

(VARIATIONS OF 10 OR MORE PERCENTAGE POINTS)

	North East	South	North Central	West	Total
d. Construction of new multi-family units	8.4	17.5	20.4	18.5	16.7
f. Providing emergency shelters	13.8	19.2	26.5	12.3	18.1
g. Direct assistance to help people own housing units	8.5	12.4	20.2	13.9	13.8
h. Construction of new public housing units	30.5	19.0	37.0	29.6	28.1
i. Rehab of public housing units	25.3	16.2	40.6	46.4	30.8
j. Weatherization	13.1	16.3	7.6	36.8	18.6
k. Site assembly	22.2	32.2	41.2	32.3	32.6
l. Construction of new single-family units	19.3	23.2	31.1	35.6	27.3

Regarding construction of new public housing units, the percentage of Southern cities that say that it is "very important" is the highest (45.3 percent) of the four regions; the percentage of North Central cities is the lowest (24.0 percent); and the Northeast and West are very similar (at 36.6 and 31.6 percent respectively). Mirroring that pattern, the percentage of Southern cities that say that new public housing units are "not important" is lowest (19.0 percent); the percentage in the North Central region is highest (37.0 percent); and the Northeast and West are virtually the same (30.5 and 29.6 percent).

Another line of analysis is the comparison of small cities that are entitled to Community Development Block Grant funds by formula versus small cities that are not entitled. In Chapter 3, we noted that non- entitlement cities were less likely than entitlement cities to give high ratings to existing Federal programs. Table IV-6 presents the data regarding the activities for which there is a difference between these two types of small cities of 10 or more percentages points. While these four differences may be statistically significant and the difference regarding rental assistance is quite large, the predominant finding here is that, in the case of 9 of the 13 activities, the difference between entitlement and nonentitlement small cities is small and no greater than 10 percentage points.

This finding reinforces the conclusion reached at the end of the previous chapter. If the needs of non-entitlement small cities seem to be roughly the same as the needs of entitlement small cities, then the striking difference between them as regards the adequacy of Federal housing assistance is all the more persuasive as a basis for arguing that these small non-entitlement communities are a special locus of negligence in the operation of Federal housing assistance.

Table IV-7 presents the comparison between large cities' and urban counties' assessments regarding the four of the 13 activities for which there a difference between large cities and urban counties of 10 percentage points or more. (The reader is reminded that the urban county data is <u>not</u> a part of the 444 respondent data base which is the foundation of all other tables and data analysis.)

TABLE IV-6

ACTIVITIES THAT WOULD BE VERY IMPORTANT
TO ALLEVIATE LOW INCOME HOUSING PROBLEMS

SMALL CITIES
(VARIATIONS OF 10 OR MORE PERCENTAGE POINTS)

	Not Entitled	Entitled	All Small Cities
a. Rental assistance (money payments)	78.1	54.2	70.6
b. Rehabilitation of single-family homes	68.3	56.0	64.3
f. Providing emergency shelters	36.4	25.0	32.7
i. Rehab of public housing units	33.7	16.7	28.1

The greatest difference is the strong emphasis among large cities on rehabilitation of public housing units (64.7 percent) and the relative lack of interest by urban counties in this (25.6 percent). There is a slightly greater tendency for large cities to say that rehabilitation activities are important than there is in urban counties. The reverse is true with the regard to the construction of new multi-family units. Beyond these differences--which probably reflect the condition of the housing stock and housing markets in older, central areas versus newer outer areas--large cities and urban counties assess the importance of most other housing assistance activities in much the same ways.

TABLE IV-7

ACTIVITIES THAT WOULD BE VERY IMPORTANT TO ALLEVIATE LOW INCOME HOUSING PROBLEMS

LARGE CITIES VERSUS URBAN COUNTIES (VARIATIONS OF 10 OR MORE PERCENTAGE POINTS)

	Large Cities	Urban Counties	Total
b. Rehabilitation of single-family homes	64.2	53.2	59.0
c. Rehab. of multi-family units (privately owned)	69.8	53.2	62.0
d. Construction of new multi-family units	53.8	72.3	62.6
i. Rehab of public housing units	64.7	25.6	46.8

CHAPTER V

PRIORITIES FOR FEDERAL HOUSING POLICY

1) Priorities

Following the question regarding the importance of various housing assistance activities (described in the previous chapter), the survey asked city officials to use that same list of activities to rank their importance for the Federal role in housing policy. Specifically, the question instructed respondents to "assume that Federal housing assistance is going to be completely revised and adequately funded. Which of the activities listed would be your city's top three priorities for emphasis in such a revised housing policy?"

In the previous question, respondents evaluated each activity separately. The rankings that result, as shown in the tables in Chapter IV are implicit rankings deriving from varying percentages of cities that said that each of the activities is "very important". In this next question, city officials were explicitly asked to compare the importance of each of these activities with all others and specifically to rank the activities first, second, and third as opposed to all of the others. For purposes of analysis, the largest distance between the activities in each city's ranking is the distance between the first, second, and third choices, taken together on the one hand, and all of the others on the other hand. Therefore, in the analyses of these data that follow, the focus is on the accumulation of the first, second, and third choices taken together as the basis for reporting cities' priorities for a revised Federal housing policy.

Table V-1 presents the aggregate frequencies of the cities' answers to this question. Each of the percentages in the table are the percent of the 444 cities that chose this activity as the first, second, or third choice.

TABLE V-I

PRIORITIES FOR A NEW FEDERAL HOUSING POLICY

		% of Cities Selecting Items as First, Second, or Third Choice
a.	Rental assistance (money payments)	60.8%
b.	Rehabilitation of single-family homes	52.9
c.	Rehab. of multi-family units (privately owned)	43.2
d.	Construction of new multi-family units	27.7
e.	Construction of new public housing units	20.7
f.	Direct assistance to help people own housing units	18.5
g.	Rehab. of public housing units	14.9
h.	Construction of new single-family units	12.2
i.	Emergency repairs	11.0
j.	Site assembly	7.4
k.	Providing emergency Shelters	7.4
l.	Weatherization	5.6
m.	Fair housing programs	2.0

Cities' top priorities for emphasis emerge fairly clearly from the table. The first priority is rental assistance (60.8); the second is rehabilitation of single-family homes (52.9 percent); and the third priority is rehabilitation of multi-family units (43.2 percent). These are the same three activities that top the ranking in Table IV-1. Activities that are seen as "very important" for addressing local low-income housing problems are also suggested as the primary emphases for Federal housing policy.

In the ranking, these three priorities are followed by a gap of about 16 percent, the largest single gap between the activities in the entire list. The fourth most frequently selected priority is construction of new multi-family units which is followed, after a gap of 7 percentage points by construction of new public housing units (20.7 percent). From "new multi-family" on down through the rest of the list, there is no gap between the activities of more than 7 percentage points.

Thus, the first major finding from the table is the clarity of the top three priorities: rental assistance, single-family rehabilitation and multi-family rehabilitation. A total of 52.3 percent of the cities' "votes"* as to priorities for Federal housing policy were given to these three activities.

A second major finding from the table also seems fairly clear: Federal support for a variety of other activities is also seen as crucial by some cities. The cities spread the other half of their "votes" across the 10 other activities. Although the orders of magnitude become quite small, there is no logical place in the remainder of the ranking list to cut it off.

---

*Each of the 444 city respondents could "vote" for a first, second, and third priority. Thus, there is a potential total of 1,332 votes (3 x 444).

2) New Construction

Another interesting aspect of the table concerns the topic of new construction. Compared to rehabilitation, there is a relative lack of emphasis by city officials here on construction of new units. Moreover, there is approximately as much emphasis on new public housing construction as there is on construction of multi-family privately-owned units. Providing new single family units is a priority for only 12.2 percent of cities. The category of new multi-family units, however, is split into two "activities" in the list. This split--although it follows the conventional distinction between privately-owned and public housing units--understates the extent to which city officials are reporting a need for newly constructed multi-family units for low-income households. When these two activities are recalculated, the result is that 42.0 percent of cities place one or the other or both among their priorities for emphasis in Federal policy. (The two percentages in Table V-1 cannot be simply added together because some cities would be counted twice.) Recalculating the same combination of public and private units for the rehabilitation category, the result is that 53.2 percent of cities rank this category among their priorities. The list in Table V-1 is thus changed somewhat:

Rental assistance	60.8% of cities
Rehabilitation, multi	53.2
Rehabilitation, single	52.9
New construction, multi	42.0

Multi-family new construction is still fourth on the list (the two sub-categories are fourth and fifth in Table V-1) but at a higher level. And, beyond these four activities, there is a drop of more than twenty percentage points to the next item in the list.

Regionally, North Central cities are least likely (31.0 percent) to make public/private new multi-family construction a priority. Northeast cities are most likely (44.0 percent) and the West (37.9

percent) and South (39.3 percent) come between. Cities of different sizes all support this as a priority with similar frequency: small--37.7 percent, medium--44.8 percent, and large--41.5 percent.

These recalculated categories are not used in the subsequent tables in this chapter because the loss of the public/private distinction dilutes the programmatic implications of the findings. Also, most cities chose either publicy-owned or privately-owned multi-family activities, suggesting that the respondents do not see these as interchangeable.

3) Priorities by Region and City Size

In the tables and the associated text on the following pages, the data in Table V-1 are disaggregated by region and city size. The focus of these analyses is on differences among regions and city size groupings. Overall, however, there is a striking degree of similarity among cities.

There also is very little variation in the degree to which cities in different regions or cities of different sizes concentrated their priority "votes" on the three top activities: rent assistance, single-family rehabilitation and multi-family rehabilitation. The index of this concentration for all cities is 52.3 percent. Table V-2 presents the indices of concentration for cities by region and by city size and shows a high degree of consensus on the priorities for emphasis in a revised Federal housing policy. This is the context in which the more specific variations in subsequent tables should be understood.

Table V-3 disaggregates the priority choices by the four major Census regions. As regards rental assistance, a lower percentage (53.6 percent) of Northeast cities give it priority as compared to the West where the highest percent of cities give it priority (67.0 percent). The variations among the regions with regard to rehabilitation of single-family and multi-family units is analogous

TABLE V-2

INDICES OF CONCENTRATION

	% of Cities Priority Votes Concentrated on Rental Assistance, Rehab-Single, and Rehab-Multi
All Cities	52.3%
Region	
North East	48.0
South	52.0
North Central	56.2
West	52.4
City Size	
Under 50,000	49.3
50,000 - 200,000	54.2
Over 200,000	53.5
Small Cities	
Entitlement	50.8
Non-entitlement	46.3
Large Jurisdictions	
Large Cities	53.5
Urban Counties	40.4

to the pattern reported in the previous chapter. (See Table IV-4a for a summary of that pattern.) Northeast cities are more interested than cities in other regions in the construction of new multi-family units. Paralleling the findings in Chapter III and in Chapter IV, Southern cities show more emphasis on public housing, both in new construction and rehabilitation, than do cities in other regions.

City size does not seem to have very much effect on selection of priorities for a revised Federal housing policy. Table V-4 presents this data. The most significant difference among the size groups of cities occurs with regard to the rental assistance activity: small cities (49.7 percent) are much less likely to give priority to this activity then are any of the cities over 50,000.

Large cities are more likely than other cities to give priority to the rehabilitation of multi-family units (52.8 percent) and to rehabilitation of public housing units (26.4 percent). There are no other differences of more than ten percentage points among the size groups.

TABLE V-3

PRIORITIES FOR FEDERAL HOUSING POLICY, BY REGION

	% of All Cities Selecting Items as First, Second or Third Choice	North East	South	North Central	West
a. Rental assistance (money payments)	60.8%	53.6%	62.2%	58.1%	67.0%
b. Rehabilitation of single-family homes	52.9	40.5	60.8	60.0	45.5
c. Rehab. of multi-family units (privately owned)	43.2	50.0	32.9	50.5	44.6
d. Construction of new multi-family units	27.7	36.9	23.8	23.8	29.5
e. Construction of new public housing units	20.7	17.9	31.5	11.4	17.9
f. Direct assistance to help people own housing units	18.5	23.8	18.9	18.1	14.3
g. Rehab. of public housing units	14.9	14.3	19.6	15.2	8.9
h. Construction of new single-family units	12.2	17.9	10.5	10.5	11.6
i. Emergency repairs	11.0	9.5	11.2	12.4	10.7
j. Site assembly	7.4	7.1	4.9	5.7	12.5
k. Providing emergency shelters	7.4	3.6	4.2	6.7	15.2
l. Weatherization	5.6	3.6	5.6	9.5	3.6
m. Fair housing programs	2.0	2.4	2.1	2.9	0.9

TABLE V-4

PRIORITIES FOR A NEW FEDERAL HOUSING POLICY, BY CITY SIZE

	% of All Cities Selecting Items as First, Second, or Third Choice	Under 50,000	50,000-200,000	Over 200,000
a. Rental assistance (money payments)	60.8%	49.7%	68.5%	60.4%
b. Rehabilitation of single-family homes	52.9	55.3	52.6	47.2
c. Rehabilitation of multi-family units (privately owned)	43.2	42.8	41.4	52.8
d. Construction of new multi-family units	27.7	24.5	29.3	30.2
e. Construction of new public housing units	20.7	20.8	20.7	20.8
f. Direct assistance to help people own housing untis	18.5	22.6	16.8	13.2
g. Rehabilitation of public housing units	14.9	17.0	10.8	26.4
h. Construction of new single-family units	12.2	15.1	9.9	13.2
i. Emergency repairs	11.0	12.6	10.3	9.4
j. Site assembly	7.4	8.8	7.8	1.9
l. Weatherization	5.6	6.9	6.0	0.0
m. Fair housing programs	2.0	1.9	2.6	0.0

Within the category of small cities (under 50,000), the data allow us to compare cities that are entitled to CDBG funds and cities that are not entitled. Table V-5 presents this comparison for the top six activities in the priority ranking. Entitled cities are more likely to give priority to the rehabilitation of single-family homes. Cities that are not CDBG-entitled are more likely to give emphasis to direct assistance to help people own their own homes. Beyond these two differences, there are no variations of more than ten percentage points between entitled and non-entitled small cities as to the priorities for a new Federal housing policy.

Table V-6 presents a comparison between large cities (over 200,000) and urban counties. There is a striking difference between these two types of jurisdictions regarding multi-family units. The percentage of each which give priority to rehabilitation and construction are approximately reversed. The reversal probably reflects the extent to which, in large cities, city officials are dealing with multi-family structures already in place while, in urban counties, officials are dealing with a situation in which land is available for multi-family units that are much in demand for in-migrants. Urban counties also place less emphasis on rehabilitation of single family houses and of public housing units than do large cities.

TABLE V-5

PRIORITIES FOR A NEW FEDERAL HOUSING POLICY: SMALL CITIES

	Entitled	Not Entitled
a. Rental assistance (money payments)	49.6%	50.0%
b. Rehabilitation of single-family homes	60.0	46.3
c. Rehabilitation of multi-family units (privately owned)	42.8	42.6
d. Construction of new multi-family units	25.7	22.3
e. Construction of new public housing units	21.0	20.4
f. Direct assistance to help people own housing units	18.1	31.4

TABLE V-6

PRIORITIES FOR A NEW FEDERAL HOUSING POLICY:
LARGE CITY/URBAN COUNTY COMPARISON

	Large Cities	Urban Counties
a. Rental assistance (money payments)	60.4%	55.3%
b. Rehabilitation of single-family homes	47.2	38.3
c. Rehabilitation of multi-family units (privately owned)	52.8	27.7
d. Construction of new multi-family units	30.2	49.0
e. Construction of new public housing units	20.8	27.6
f. Rehabilitation of public housing units	26.4	10.7
g. Construction of new single-family units	13.2	17.0

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

THE RESEARCH PROCESS AND THE SAMPLE

Research Process

In March 1986, NLC sent a survey questionnaire to 940 communities. The purpose of the survey was to gather current information on three specific questions:

(1) Which groups of people face housing problems?

(2) How do city officials evaluate the effectiveness of existing Federal programs?

(3) What kinds of activities do city officials think are necessary to address current housing problems of poor people?

The survey questionnaire had four major sections, A-D, covering (A) housing problems and possible solutions, (B) existing housing programs, (C) structure of local housing administration, and (D) additional comments related to particular local innovations and policy priorities. This report focuses on the first two sections of the questionnaire and incorporates additional relevant information from the other sections.

When we selected the group of cities to survey, we first decided to send questionnaires to all those cities with populations of more than 50,000. Since we also wanted to sample cities with populations of less than 50,000, we chose two groups among these smaller cities: (1) all those communities entitled to receive Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds and (2) a sample of small communities which are not entitled. Finally, we also

decided to send questionnaires to the set of all urban counties which are CDBG entitled (and have a population of 200,000 and over); the thought was that data from these counties would contribute to characterizations of large metropolitan areas.

In March 1986, the survey was mailed to 940 jurisdictions which emerged from these initial specifications. Since all cities over 50,000 are by definition CDBG-entitled, the list turned out to consist of three convenient groups:

(1) the 707 cities of all sizes listed by HUD as CDBG entitlement communities for FY 1985;

(2) the sample of 150 non-entitlement small cities; and

(3) the 107 urban counties listed by HUD as CDBG entitlement communities for FY 1985.

The samples of entitlement communities, both cities and urban counties, were straightforward. Lists were simply drawn from HUD's Directory of Allocations for Fiscal Years 1980-1985.

For the non-entitlement small cities, the selection process was slightly more complicated since there are thousands of small cities. A list of NLC member cities which are also non-entitlements was available; under the assumption that this list was not biased in any relevant way, we randomly selected a group of 150 small nonentitlement cities distributed evenly over the four basic geographical regions used in the survey. In the end, the selection yielded 37 cities each from the Northeast, North Central, and South regions and 39 cities from the West, for a total of 150 nonentitlement communities.

Surveys were mailed to the mayor or manager in each city, with a request that he or she complete the questionnaire or have another knowledgeable person complete it. The intention was that the questions would be answered by a city official whom the chief executive felt to be a well-informed spokesperson.

In April, a follow-up memorandum with a second questionnaire was mailed to all cities which had not yet responded. By mid-June, we had received a total of 491 returns from 388 entitlement cities, 56 non-entitlement cities, and 47 entitlement urban counties.

Profile of the Respondents

The response rate for the survey was 51.5 percent overall. (See Table I-I)

TABLE I-I

RESPONDENTS--BY CATEGORIES IN THE RESEARCH SAMPLE

	Number of Questionnaires Sent	Number Returned	Percent Returned
Cities:	857	444	51.8%
Entitlement	707	388	54.9
Non-entitlement	150	56	37.3
Urban Counties	107	47	43.9
Total	954	491	51.5

The 444 responses from cities constitute the primary data base for this study. The urban county responses are not a part of that 444 data base. The 47 urban county responses are used throughout the report as a comparison with the large cities (which are a part of the 444).

The next several tables present further description of the responding communities. Table I-2 shows the respondents by region.

TABLE I-2

RESPONDENTS BY REGION

	Number of Jurisdictions	Percent of Respondents
Northeast	91	18.5%
South	163	33.2
North Central	113	23.0
West	124	25.3
Total	491	100.0%

In addition to these four regions, the Census Bureau also uses nine "divisions" to look at characteristics of different sections of the country. Table I-3 shows how the states are grouped into these divisions. Analysis and cross-tabulations in this report rely primarily on the broader regions with mention of divisions where appropriate.

TABLE I-3

REGIONS AND DIVISIONS

Northeast Region

New England Division
- Maine
- New Hampshire
- Vermont
- Massachusetts
- Rhode Island
- Connecticut

Mid-Atlantic
- New York
- New Jersey
- Pennsylvania
- Puerto Rico

North Central Region

East North Central
- Ohio
- Indiana
- Illinois
- Michigan
- Wisconsin

West North Central
- Minnesota
- Iowa
- Missouri
- North Dakota
- South Dakota
- Nebraska
- Kansas

South Region

South Atlantic
- Delaware
- Maryland
- District of Columbia
- Virginia
- West Virginia
- North Carolina
- South Carolina
- Georgia
- Florida

East South Central
- Kentucky
- Tennessee
- Alabama
- Mississippi

West South Central
- Arkansas
- Louisiana
- Oklahoma
- Texas

West Region

Mountain
- Montana
- Idaho
- Wyoming
- Colorado
- New Mexico
- Arizona
- Utah
- Nevada

Pacific
- Washington
- Oregon
- California
- Alaska
- Hawaii

Table I-4 presents a profile of responding cities based on differences in population size.

TABLE I-4

RESPONDENTS BY POPULATION CATEGORIES

Population	Number of Cities	Percent of Respondents
Small	**159**	**35.8%**
Less than 10,000	15	3.4
10,000-19,999	21	4.7
20,000-49,999	123	27.7
Medium	**232**	**52.3**
50,000-99,999	152	34.2
100,000-199,999	80	18.0
Large	**53**	**11.9**
200,000--499,999	32	7.2
500,000 or more	21	4.7
Total	**444**	**100.0%**

Of the 73 cities with populations over 200,000, 53 responded to the survey; in this report, these are classified as "large" cities. Cities between 50,000 and 199,999 are classified as "medium", and all those less than 50,000 are "small". The analyses in the report rely on these three categories.

In order to enrich the description of the spectrum of population size, two supplementary types of analysis are also provided. Among the small cities, a distinction can be made between those

with CDBG entitlement status and those without. Of 159 small cities which submitted responses, 105 are entitled and the remaining 54 are non-entitled. The interesting differences between these two groups are highlighted throughout the report. At the other end of the size spectrum, the second type of supplementary analysis is a comparison between those cities in the large population category and the urban counties. There are 53 large cities and 47 urban counties among the survey responses. Both kinds of jurisdictions have populations of over 200,000, and both are entitled to CDBG funds. Again, this comparison is included where it enhances the description of results.

The next table, Table I-5, shows the distribution of respondents by city type. The sample was weighted towards the "central city" category by virtue of the fact that all central cities of an MSA are qualified as entitlement cities by definition.

TABLE I-5

RESPONDENTS BY CITY TYPE

	Number of Jurisdictions	Percent of Respondents
Central Cities	238	48.5%
Suburbs	138	28.1
Non-metropolitan	68	13.8
Urban Counties	47	9.6

Finally, to complete the picture of respondents, Table I-6 displays the different types of city officials who filled out the questionnaire.

TABLE I-6

RESPONDENTS BY POSITION IN LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Position	Number of Respondents	Percent of Respondents
Mayor	43	8.8%
Council Member	2	.4
City Commissioner	2	.4
City Manager	30	6.1
Member of Mayor's or Manager's Staff	44	9.0
City Department Head	176	35.8
Other	194	39.5

FREQUENCY DATA FROM SURVEY

"HOUSING PROBLEMS IN AMERICA'S CITIES"

NATIONAL LEAGUE OF CITIES
1986

This document presents the original survey questions and the frequencies (in percentages) of the respondents' answers. Frequencies are a percent of the number of respondents who answered that specific question (e.g., N = 399). The total number of cities that responded to the survey is 444. In cases where long lists of items are presented, the items have been re-arranged into descending order of frequencies in the first column. Data for some questions in the survey are not presented here, because they allowed open-ended answers and are thus difficult to summarize, or because the question is not treated in the text of this report.

Characteristics of The 444 Responding Cities

1. Type of City

	Percent	Number
Central City	53.6%	238
Suburban City	31.1	138
Non-metropolitan City	15.3	68

2. Population

Less than 10,000	3.4%	15
10,000 to 19,999	4.7	21
20,000 to 49,999	27.7	123
50,000 to 99,999	34.2	152
100,000 to 199,999	18.0	80
200,000 to 499,999	7.2	32
500,000 or more	4.7	21

4. Region

Northeast	18.9%	84
South	32.2	143
North Central	23.6	105
West	25.2	112

5. CDBG Entitlement Status

Entitled	87.4%	388
Nonentitlement	12.6	56

1. For people in each of the following groups in your city, how severe are the problems they face in finding housing that is decent, appropriate, and affordable?

		Face Severe Problems	Face Moderate Problems	Face Few Problems	Number of Respondents (N)
a.	Homeless people	58.0%	31.2%	10.8%	388
b.	Low income renters	53.4	40.5	6.1	440
c.	Low income homeowners	39.6	51.0	9.4	437
d.	Families with 3 or more children	39.1	47.1	13.8	435
e.	Female-headed households	36.3	50.2	13.5	438
f.	Recent immigrants	33.1	43.8	23.1	299
g.	Handicapped persons	22.6	57.3	20.0	424
h.	Elderly	21.1	59.0	19.9	437
i.	Blacks	16.3	49.6	34.1	405
j.	Hispanics	12.7	52.3	35.0	346
k.	Young couples	7.2	45.8	47.0	432
l.	Single persons	5.0	34.3	60.8	423
m.	Other _____	57.0	31.4	11.6	86

2. This question has several parts and it refers back to your answers to the previous question. It asks you to imagine that all Federal housing assistance has disappeared.

Assume that no Federal housing assistance is available.

(a) Which three of the above groups of the low and moderate income population would be most in need of assistance in your city? (N = 444 for each of the first three columns. N = 444 for each row in the fourth column.)

		First Choice	Second Choice	Third Choice	% of Cities Selecting Items as First Second, or Third Choice
a.	Low income renters	40.1%	23.0%	13.1%	76.1%
b.	Elderly	18.5	16.4	23.0	47.3
c.	Families with 3 or more children	13.3	13.1	12.6	39.0
d.	Female-headed households	8.1	16.4	12.4	40.3
e.	Low income homeowners	7.2	14.6	13.3	35.1
f.	Homeless people	4.7	6.3	11.5	22.5
g.	Blacks	1.4	2.5	2.9	6.8
h.	Handicapped persons	0.9	1.8	6.1	8.8
i.	Young couples	0.9	2.0	1.8	4.7
j.	Recent immigrants	0.7	1.8	1.4	3.8
k.	Hispanics	0.5	0.9	1.8	3.2
l.	Single persons	0.0	0.5	1.8	2.3
m.	Other _____	1.4	0.0	1.4	3.6
n.	No response	2.5	1.4	3.6	7.5

(b) Now please indicate the most appropriate general ways of addressing the housing problems of these three groups most in need in your city (from previous question.)

(c) Next please indicate whether your city--from whatever sources other than Federal--could provide half or more of the needed assistance over the next five years.

Groups		Forms of Assistance: Make more units available	Preserve existing housing/ prevent displacement	Provide money to make units affordable	Help overcome discrimination	Without Federal aid city could provide half or more of assistance needed
First:	N = 444	60.8%	56.1%	71.2%	10.6%	3.6%
Second:	N = 444	56.3	56.3	69.4	12.8	3.4
Third:	N = 444	57.2	55.0	63.1	17.1	4.1

3. Following are several categories of activities that might alleviate the housing problems of poor people. The mix of activities needed will vary among cities.

Regardless of whether your city now has these activities, please indicate how important each of these activities would be, in your opinion, in addressing the housing needs of low and moderate income households in your city.

	Very Important	Moderately Important	Not Important	Number of Respondents (N)
a. Rental assistance (money payments)	79.9%	18.8%	1.4%	436
b. Rehabilitation of single-family homes	63.1	31.9	5.0	439
c. Rehab. of multi-family units (privately owned)	60.0	31.5	8.5	435
d. Construction of new multi-family units	44.5	38.7	16.7	431
e. Emergency repairs	42.4	47.5	10.1	434
f. Providing emergency shelters	40.6	41.3	18.1	414

	Very Important	Moderately Important	Not Important	Number of Respondents (N)
g. Direct assistance to help people own housing units	39.4%	46.8%	13.8%	419
h. Construction of new public housing units	35.3	36.7	28.1	417
i. Rehab of public housing units	33.5	35.7	30.8	412
j. Weatherization	32.6	48.9	18.6	436
k. Site assembly	26.2	41.2	32.6	386
l. Construction of new single-family units	22.9	49.8	27.3	428
m. Fair housing programs	19.4	52.2	28.4	423
n. Other (Specify) _____	86.1	13.9	0.0	36

4. Now assume that Federal housing assistance is going to be completely revised and adequately funded. Which of the activities listed above (in Question 3) would be your city's top priorities for emphasis in such a revised Federal housing policy? (N = 444 for each of the first three columns. N = 444 for each row in the fourth column.)

	First Choice	Second Choice	Third Choice	% of Cities Selecting Items as First Second, or Third Choice
a. Rental assistance (money payments)	30.6%	17.1%	13.1%	60.8%
b. Rehabilitation of single-family homes	20.0	19.1	13.7	52.9
c. Rehab. of multi-family units (privately owned)	9.7	19.8	13.7	43.2
d. Construction of new multi-family units	9.5	9.9	8.3	27.7

	First Choice	Second Choice	Third Choice	% of Cities Selecting Items as First Second, or Third Choice
e. Construction of new public housing units	8.8%	5.2%	6.8%	20.7
f. Construction of new single-family units	5.0	3.8	3.4	12.2
g. Rehab. of public housing units	3.4	3.8	7.7	14.9
h. Site Assembly	3.2	2.0	2.3	7.4
i. Emergency repairs	1.1	3.4	6.5	11.0
j. Direct assistance to help people own housing units	0.9	8.3	9.2	18.5
k. Providing emergency shelters	0.5	2.0	5.0	7.4
l. Fair housing programs	0.2	2.0	5.0	7.4
m. Weatherization	0.0	2.0	3.6	5.6
n. Other (Specify) _____	0.9	0.2	0.9	2.0
o. No Response	6.3	2.7	4.5	14.7

5. Please assess the value of each of the Federal programs listed below. For each dollar spent on each program in your jurisdiction, which programs produce a relatively great benefit in meeting the housing needs of poor people in your city? Which show less effectiveness (or "bang for the buck")? Suggestion: imagine that your jurisdiction spends the same amount on each program and compare the programs according to the benefits they produce.

	Highly cost effective; great benefit for each dollar spent	Moderately cost effective; moderate benefit for each dollar spent	Not cost effective; little benefit per dollar	Number of Respondents (N)
a. CDBG	84.7%	13.8%	1.5%	412
b. Section 8 - Existing Housing	69.3	29.0	1.7	411
c. Urban Development Action Grant Program	62.1	29.4	8.5	153

	Highly cost effective; great benefit for each dollar spent	Moderately cost effective; moderate benefit for each dollar spent	Not cost effective; little benefit per dollar	Number of Respondents (N)
d. Rental Rehabilitation Grants	61.2%	30.6%	8.3%	327
e. Public Housing Modernization Program	58.6	37.5	3.9	256
f. Public Housing Operating Subsidy Program	55.7	40.3	4.0	273
g. Section 202 (Elderly and Handicapped)	55.5	41.3	3.2	283
h. Section 8 - Rehabilitation Housing	48.6	44.4	7.0	286
i. HoDAG	45.1	46.2	8.8	91
j. Housing Vouchers	44.7	48.2	7.1	226
k. Farmers Home Administration Homeownership Program (Section 502)	44.6	37.5	17.9	56
l. Multifamily IDBs	43.7	45.9	10.4	183
m. Low Income Public Housing Program (Construction)	43.6	44.7	11.7	257
n. Single Family MRBs	42.0	46.0	12.1	174
o. Rehabilitation Loan Program (Section 312)	41.5	43.8	14.7	265
p. FmHA Rural Rental Housing Program (Section 515)	40.6	43.8	15.6	32
q. Flexible Subsidy Program (Troubled Public Housing Projects	40.0	43.6	16.4	55
r. Urban Homesteading Program	36.6	43.0	20.4	93

	Highly cost effective; great benefit for each dollar spent	Moderately cost effective; moderate benefit for each dollar spent	Not cost effective; little benefit per dollar	Number of Respondents (N)
s. Section 8 - Newly Constructed Housing	32.8%	50.2%	17.0%	271
t. Section 236 (Multi-family (Rental)	25.9	60.4	13.7	197
u. Section 235 and 235 Revised (Single-Family)	23.4	61.7	14.9	188
v. Other (Specify) _____	85.0	15.0	0.0	20

6. Of all the Federally aided programs listed above, which are the most cost-effective in your jurisdiction? (N = 444 for each of the first three columns. N = 444 for each row in the fourth column.)

	First Choice	Second Choice	Third Choice	% of Cities Selecting Items as First, Second, or Third Choice
a. CDBG	43.7%	18.0%	11.3%	73.0%
b. Section 8 - Existing Housing	17.8	17.8	11.5	47.1
c. Low Income Public Housing Program (Construction)	4.7	2.9	4.5	12.2
d. Public Housing Operating Subsidy Program	4.1	5.6	5.9	15.5
e. Rental Rehabilitation Grants	3.6	14.6	9.7	27.9
f. Urban Development Action Grant Program	3.6	4.1	3.4	11.0

	First Choice	Second Choice	Third Choice	% of Cities Selecting Items as First, Second, or Third Choice
g. Section 8 - Rehabilitation Housing	3.4%	4.3%	4.7%	12.4%
h. Section 202 (Elderly and Handicapped)	2.5	4.1	8.1	14.6
i. Multifamily IDBs	2.5	2.5	2.0	7.0
j. Public Housing Modernization Program	2.3	4.1	5.2	11.5
k. Section 8 - Newly Constructed Housing	1.8	3.8	4.7	10.4
l. Rehabilitation Loan Program (Section 312)	1.6	3.6	4.1	9.2
m. Housing Vouchers	0.9	1.8	2.3	5.0
n. Farmers Home Administration Homeownership Program (Section 502)	0.5	0.5	0.2	1.1
o. Section 235 and 235 Revised (Single-Family)	0.5	0.7	1.8	2.9
p. Urban Homesteading Program	0.2	0.7	1.8	2.7
q. Flexible Subsidy Program (Troubled Public Housing Projects	0.2	0.0	0.7	0.9
r. HoDAG	0.2	0.9	0.9	2.0
s. Single Family MRBs	0.2	1.4	3.6	5.2
t. FmHA Rural Rental Housing Program (Section 515)	0.0	0.5	0.5	0.9
u. Section 236 (Multi-family (Rental)	0.0	1.1	1.4	2.5
v. Other (Specify) _____	0.2	0.5	0.9	1.6
w. No response	5.6	6.8	11.0	23.4

7. If funding for these three Federal programs (in previous question) were (or has been) terminated, how much of the money, if any, would likely be replaced from other sources?

	Little or no replacement	Less than half	More than half	Number of Respondents
First:	83.0%	14.8%	2.2%	405
Second:	87.0	11.0	2.0	391
Third:	87.6	10.4	1.9	364

8. Which of the following best characterizes your jurisdiction's relationship with the local housing authority? (N = 444)

   1. The agency is a separate city entity with its own board. 56.8%
   2. The agency is a separate entity responsible directly to the mayor or city manager. 8.6%
   3. Public housing is not a city agency but countywide 19.4%
   4. Other (briefly describe) 15.4%

9. Are any city dollars (including CDBG) used in your public housing program? (N = 444)

   1. No 51.4%
   2. Yes, but a limited amount and only for special service programs 26.1%
   3. Yes, significant support for a variety of services 8.8%
   4. Other (explain) _____ 13.8%

10. What statement best describes your jurisdiction's relationship with community-based organizations (CBOs) as they relate to housing and community development? (N = 444)

   1. No relationship. 20.7%
   2. CBOs play a minor role and receive no grants or contracts from the city. 26.8%
   3. CBOs have a number of grants or contracts for very specific activities in the city's housing and CD program. 31.1%

4. Several CBOs not only have grants and contracts for specific city-defined tasks but also get general support for their own projects 13.3%

5. CBOs and other non-profit groups are the major means of implementation of city housing programs. 3.8%

6. Other 4.3%

APPENDIX C

List of Cities that Responded to NLC's Housing Survey 1986

Alabama

Anniston
Birmingham
Dothan
Enterprise
Florence
Gadsden
Mobile
Tuscaloosa

Arizona

Casa Grande
Flagstaff
Paradise Valley
Phoenix
Scottsdale
Sierra Vista
Tempe
Tucson

Arkansas

Fort Smith
Jacksonville
North Little Rock
Pine Bluff

California

Alameda
Anaheim
Antioch
Bellflower
Carson
Chico
Chula Vista
Claremont
Concord
Daly City
El Cajon
Escondido
Eureka
Fremont
Garden Grove
Glendale
Hawthorne
Hayward
Huntington Beach
Inglewood
Irvine
Lakewood
Livermore
Lomita
Lompoc
Lynwood
Modesto
Monterey
Mountain View
National City
Oceanside
Orange
Oxnard
Palmdale
Palo Alto
Pasadena
Pico Rivera
Pleasant Hill
Pomona
Porterville
Rancho Cucamonga
Redding
Redondo Beach
Redwood City
Riverside
Salinas
San Bernardino
San Diego
San Francisco
Santa Ana
Santa Barbara
Santa Cruz
Santa Monica
Seaside
Thousand Oaks
Tulare
Turlock
West Covina
Whittier
Woodland

Colorado

Arvada
Aurora
Boulder
Colorado Springs
Denver
Greeley
La Junta
Lakewood
Pueblo
Westminster

Connecticut

Danbury
East Hartford

Connecticut

East Haven
Fairfield
Greenwich
Hartford
Meriden
New London
Norwalk
Stamford
Torrington
West Haven
Winchester

District of Columbia

Washington, DC

Delaware

Wilmington

Florida

Atlantic Beach
Bradenton
Cape Coral
Cocoa
Daytona Beach
Fort Myers
Hialeah
Hollywood
Melbourne
Miami Beach
Naples
Ocala
Orlando
Ormond Beach
Panama City
Sarasota
South Daytona
Tampa
Titusville
West Palm Beach
Winter Haven

Georgia

Albany
Augusta
Brunswick
Columbus
Macon
Marietta
Savannah
Warner Robins

Hawaii

Honolulu

Idaho

Boise City
Pocatello

Illinois

Aurora
Bloomington
Blue Island
Champaign
Decatur
Des Plaines
Gurnee
Joliet
Moline
Normal
Paris
Peoria
Rantoul
Rock Island
Skokie
Springfield
Urbana

Indiana

Bloomington
Elkhart
Evansville
Indianapolis
Lafayette
Mishawaka
New Albany
South Bend
West Lafayette

Iowa

Burlington
Cedar Falls
Cedar Rapids
Davenport
Des Moines
Iowa City
Waterloo

Kansas

Atchison
Leavenworth
Olathe
Topeka

Kentucky

Covington
Franklin
Louisville
Owensboro

Louisiana

Houma
Kenner
Lafayette
Lake Charles
Monroe
New Orleans
Shreveport
Westwego

Maine

Brewer
Lewiston
Portland

Maryland

Baltimore
Cumberland
Hagerstown

Massachusetts

Attleboro
Boston
Cambridge
Fitchburg
Haverhill
Lynn
New Bedford
Newton
Northampton
Pittsfield
Salem
Springfield
Waltham

Michigan

Dearborn Heights
Detroit
Farmington Hills
Flint
Grand Rapids
Holland
Lansing
Lincoln Park
Livonia
Monroe
Muskegon
Port Huron
Portage
Saginaw
Taylor
Westland
Wyoming

Minnesota

Albert Lea
Bloomington
Mankato
Minneapolis
Moorhead
Rochester
Roseville
St. Paul

Mississippi

Biloxi
Meridian
Pascagoula

Missouri

Columbia
Florissant
Kansas City
Springfield
St. Joseph
St. Louis
St. Peters

Montana

Billings
Great Falls

Nebraska

Lincoln
Omaha

Nevada

Henderson
Reno

New Hampshire

Rochester

New Jersey

Clifton
Hamilton
Irvington
Long Branch
Millville
New Brunswick
Newark
Old Bridge
Orange
Parsippany
Perth Amboy
Sayreville
Toms River
Trenton
Vineland

New Mexico

Albuquerque
Las Cruces
Santa Fe

New York

Albany
Binghamton
Buffalo
New Rochelle
New York
Newburgh
Port Jervis
Rochester
Rome
Syracuse
Troy
White Plains

North Carolina

Asheville
Burlington
Charlotte
Concord
Conover
Durham
Fayetteville
Goldsboro
Greensboro
Hickory
High Point
Lenoir
Raleigh
Whiteville
Winston-Salem

North Dakota

Bismarck
Fargo

Ohio

Akron
Brook Park
Cleveland
Cleveland Heights
Columbus
Dayton
Eastlake
Elyria
Euclid
Kent
Kettering
Lakewood
Lima
Lorain
Mansfield
Marietta
Newark
Ravenna
Springfield
Warren

Oklahoma

Guymon
Lawton
Midwest City
Norman

Oklahoma

Oklahoma City
Shawnee
Tulsa

Oregon

Eugene
Grants Pass
Medford
Newberg
Portland
Springfield
The Dalles

Pennsylvania

Allentown
Altoona
Ardmore
Chester
Erie
Harrisburg
Lancaster
Levittown
McKeesport
New Castle
Philadelphia
Pittsburgh
State College
Upper Darby
Wilkes-Barre
Williamsport
York

Puerto Rico

Arecibo
Caguas
Carolina
San Juan
San Sebastian

Rhode Island

Lincoln
Providence

South Carolina

Charleston
Columbia
Greenville
North Charleston
North Myrtle Beach
Rock Hill
Spartanburg

South Dakota

Rapid City
Sioux Falls

Tennessee

Bristol
Chattanooga
Clarksville
Dayton
Johnson City
Kingsport
Knoxville
Memphis
Murfreesboro
Nashville
Pulaski

Texas

Abilene
Arlington
Austin
Baytown
Brownsville
Bryan
College Station
Commerce
Dallas
Edinburg
El Paso
Galveston
Grand Prairie
Harlingen
Laredo
Longview
Lubbock
McAllen
Mesquite
Odessa
Pasadena
Plano
Port Arthur
San Angelo
San Antonio
Texarkana
Tyler
Victoria

Texas

Waco
Wichita Falls

Utah

Ogden
Provo
Salt Lake City
Sandy City

Virginia

Alexandria
Hampton
Hopewell
Newport News
Norfolk
Richmond
Roanoke
Virginia Beach

Vermont

Burlington
Rutland

Washington

Auburn
Bellevue
Bellingham
Bremerton
Everett
Kennewick
Olympia
Richland
Seattle
Spokane
Tacoma
Vancouver
Yakima

West Virginia

Charleston
Parkersburg
Weirton

Wisconsin

Appleton
Beloit
Eau Claire
Green Bay
Kenosha
Milwaukee
Neenah
Oshkosh
Racine
Wauwatosa

Wyoming

Douglas

URBAN COUNTIES THAT RESPONDED TO NLC'S HOUSING SURVEY 1986

1. Maricopa County, Arizona
2. Pima County, Arizona
3. Contra Costa County, Calf.
4. Los Angeles County, Calf.
5. Riverside County, Calf.
6. San Bernardino County, Calf.
7. San Diego County, Calf.
8. San Mateo County, Calf.
9. Santa Clara County, Calf.
10. Sonoma County, Calf.
11. New Castle County, Delaware
12. Broward County, Florida
13. Dade County, Florida
14. Duval County, Florida
15. Hillsborough County, Florida
16. Orange County, Florida
17. Palm Beach County, Florida
18. Pinellas County, Florida
19. Polk County, Florida
20. Volusia County, Florida
21. DeKalb County, Georgia
22. Fulton County, Georgia
23. Du Page County, Illinois
24. Lake County, Illinois
25. Jefferson Parish, Louisiana
26. Baltimore County, Maryland
28. Oakland County, Michigan
29. Hennepin County, Minnesota
30. Bergen County, New Jersey
31. Morris County, New Jersey
32. Union County, New Jersey
33. Monroe County, New York
34. Cuyahoga County, Ohio
35. Franklin County, Ohio
36. Montgomery County, Ohio
37. Multnomah County, Oregon
38. Chester County, Penn.
39. Delaware County, Penn.
40. Montgomery County, Penn.
41. Greenville County, SC
42. Tarrant County, Texas
43. Arlington County, Virginia
44. Fairfax County, Virginia
45. Pierce County, Washington
46. Milwaukee County, Wisconsin
47. Salt Lake County, Utah

About The National League of Cities

The National League of Cities was established in 1924 by and for reform-minded state municipal leagues. It now represents 49 leagues and some 1,300 cities directly and, through the membership of the state municipal leagues, more than 16,000 cities indirectly.

NLC serves as an advocate for its members in Washington in the legislative, administrative, and judicial processes that affect them; develops and pursues a national urban policy that meets the present and future needs of our nation's cities and the people who live in them; offers training, technical assistance and information to municipal officials to help them improve the quality of local government in our urban nation; and undertakes research and analysis on topics and issues of importance to the nation's cities.

NATIONAL LEAGUE OF CITIES
1301 Pennsylvania Avenue NW
Washington, D.C. 20004
(202) 626-3000